

557237

1913
TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

THE
LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

VOL. XLIII—NO. 3.

JULY, 1913.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1913

Lutheran
* DA

CONTENTS

I. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT IN THE CHURCH	323
BY WILLIAM B. PATTERSON.	
II. THE CHARACTER OF PREACHING	357
BY REV. J. M. REIMENSNYDER, D.D.	
III. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD	368
BY REV. J. S. SIMON, D.D.	
IV. GERMAN-AMERICAN LITERATURE	375
BY LUCY FORNEY BITTENDER.	
V. THE PARABLES AND THEIR INTERPRETATION....	389
BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D.	
VI. MARTIN LUTHER IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY..	394
BY PROFESSOR CHARLES W. SUPER.	
VII. THE BOOK OF JOB : A CRITICAL STUDY.....	410
BY WALTER KRUMWEIDE.	
VIII. THE ATTITUDE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA TOWARD MODERN THOUGHT	418
BY REV. AUGUST SPIECKERMANN.	
IX. THE CONFESSIONAL HISTORY OF THE GENERAL SYNOD.	426
BY WAYNE O. KANTNER.	
X. CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.	448
I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.	
II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M., B.D.	
XI. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.	464
Gettysburg, Stories of the Red Harvest and the Aftermath—Roman Catholicism Capitulating Before Protestantism—The Making of Tomorrow—Socialism, Its Strength, Weakness, Problems and Future—Religion and Life—The Book Without a Name—The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism—Populaere Symbolik—A Beginner's Course in Bible Study—One Hundred Chapel Talks to Theological Students.	

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JULY, 1913.

ARTICLE I.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT IN THE CHURCH.

Copyrighted 1913 by William B. Patterson.

(A lecture delivered February 6th before the faculties and students of the Pennsylvania College and the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., by William B. Patterson, Secretary of the Commission on Social Service of the Inter-church Federation of Philadelphia.)

In this present day of the changing order we have witnessed the coming together of the ends of the earth. The quest of the poles is accomplished. The distance between the East and the West is no longer an unsolved problem in higher mathematics. In point of time vast stretches of space are literally annihilated by the utilization of the world-old currents of the air. Bands of steel and strands of copper and huge cables that rest in the bed of the ocean link together the four corners of the world. The universe, in fine, has become simply one great neighborhood.

We touch elbows with China and India. "Darkest Africa" is an obsolete phrase. Automobiles regularly traverse the Sahara. Nearly all of the great Continent where Moffat and Livingston wrought and where Gordon met his heroic death and where Cecil Rhodes worked out his dreams of empire, can be traveled in a parlor car.

Khartum twenty-five years ago was a rendezvous for cannibals. To-day Khartum is a winter resort, with elementary and secondary schools. More than this—it is the seat of a thriving college. Cotton grows under irrigation in the Sudan.

Few indeed are the blank spaces on the map of the world. The heart of Thibet, for centuries inaccessible to the traveler, has been explored and charted. A white race, the very existence of which was until recently unsuspected, has been discovered among the Esquimaux at the top of the world.

China, the hope and despair of ages past, has thrown off the shackles of the centuries and, arising from her lethargy, has come forth into the fellowship of the world powers as a giant Republic, with all doors open to the trade and travel of the nations—and with her women demanding the suffrage.

Here in America, where the pulse of progress has beat hardest, the line of advance has forged through the outposts of the Frontier, and the Frontier itself has given way to the irresistible pressure of the pioneer—first towards the West, thence towards the North and Northwest, until finally the Frontier reaches the icy stretches of the Arctic regions and is lost at the point where join the old world and the new. Thus has vanished the American Frontier.

A marvel of the twentieth century is the development of Canada and the Northwest. Two great railways bisect South America. Democracy has permeated Mexico, now in the throes of her struggle for progress. Projected is a seaport in Hudson's Bay. A great, Gargantuan gash, man-made, in the Isthmus of Panama, brings into juxtaposition the seaboard of the Atlantic and the Pacific.

And with these titanic accomplishments have come problems commensurate with the immensity and the tremendous significance of these heroic prodigious achievements.

Our thoughts to-day are cast in continental mould. Our utterances are in terms of millions. And our religion to-day is of a universal reach, and of a world-wide appeal, incomparably greater than at any time in the world's history.

Our old terms are giving way. Old methods press for reconstruction. Old plans go into the melting pot. All have served, gloriously, efficiently, their purposes. Unchanging only are the absolutely basic fundamentals—and they, too, call for restate-

ment in the understandable, cogent terms of this day.

America worshiped for a century at the shrine of Independence. To-day we hail Interdependence as the talismanic term.

Plymouth Rock, venerated for generations, has its modern counterpart in Ellis Island.

Europe has measured Autocracy and Aristocracy with Democracy, and the old gods have fallen.

Science contrasts Cure with Prevention, and gives stress to the latter. Sanitoriums clear the way for Preventoriums.

Religion analyzes the relative values of Rescue and Preservation, of Reformation and Preformation, of Palliation and Eradication, of Alleviation and Annihilation, and the decision to-day falls with unerring logic in favor of the positive, the constructive, the conserving, the cause-seeking terms.

And even Modern Industry, that one great institution of our social order which has not yet set itself in the way of regeneration, is gradually coming to apprehend its ignominy and is slowly turning towards the light.

The salvation of the individual takes on a newer, an Imperial meaning—for it now but marks, in the newer thought of these days, the point of enlistment in a service that has a world-redemption for its goal.

And so the world, its vast expanses fenceless, and with free course of approach, has in very truth become the parish of the Church, the field of a Religion which shall speak—which does speak—to a world-neighborhood in Imperial terms. And this parish is the arena in which shall be wrought out the solutions to the problems caused by the awakening of all the earth.

Upon the Church of Christ beats hard the pressure of these problems. There is an insistent, at times a clamorous call for solution. Just how and where and in what measure shall the Church function with these forces, of which she is one, that have made for the gigantic advance of the past few years?

Shall there be a democratizing, a socializing of Religion; sanctioned by the Church, projected by the Church, vehicled by the Church? Or, shall the Church continue along the time-honored course, hallowed and revered, seeking exclusively the redemption of the individual, in itself of absolute and surpassing importance, but dealing only incidentally with the salvation, the Christianization, of the institutions of life?

What is the kingdom of God? Where is the kingdom of God? Has it been adequately defined and its location permanently fixed? Or is the Church still on the voyage of its discovery?

What has the Church to do with Industry, with Capital and Labor, with Strikes and Lockouts, with Occupational Diseases, with Tuberculosis, with Pure Food and Pure Milk and Pure Water; with the exploitation by Commercialized Greed of tender Children and under-nourished women, with the Capitalization of Vice, with the de-idealizing of the Immigrant, with Work and Wages, Health and Housing, Politics, Recreation and Amusements and Education—in fine, with all of these and kindred social problems which the changing order of this generation puts to the fore?

What, in short, is the message of sympathy, of warning, of consolation, of concern, of intelligent helpfulness, and conservation and construction, which the Church must bring to those who are in the moil and welter of the world's work?

What is the so-called "new evangelism" of which we hear? To what extent does the Church accept it? At what point does the Church depart from it? Is it, in fact, a *new* evangelism? Is it not, rather, a restating in newer terms of the evangelism to which the Church has been committed for centuries? Of the evangelism which Christ principled to the lawyer when He defined the Great Commandment; and of the evangelism which the Master typified in the person of the Good Samaritan?

What is meant by Social Application of Religion, or Social Service? And what does it involve? Has it come to tear down our altars and to minimize the importance and necessity of entrance into the individual heart and life of the saving grace of our Divine Lord?

Is Social Religion new to the thought and practice of the Church? Is it not, rather, a term that issues from a modernizing of the divine platform on which the Church has stood for ages as the representative of Christ in the world?

Just what is the Church? May we ask reverently whether it is indeed the body of the Christ? If so, what of the scores and scores of sections into which it is divided? And if there has been fault and error and lack of comprehensiveness in expressing Religion, and if the matchless ideal of Christianity has been dimmed by the mists and clouds of practicability and of materi-

alism, then just who, or what, is to be blamed? Where does the censure rest? Is not the Church, after all, merely an abstract term? Or, is the Church simply the aggregation of you, and of me, and of all others who are followers of Christ?

And if this be so, do not these questions of the social order and these problems of the unrest of to-day resolve themselves into personal problems, to be met and solved by individual men and women in association with individual men and women?

And so we ask, What is the place of the Church in the changing order? What is the task of Christianity to-day, under these new, these epoch-making conditions?

These are but a few of the questions which arise in any large consideration of the problems of the social, industrial and religious orders. They are honest questions, They are not easily met. Consecrated men seek the answers. Absolutely sincere men disagree in conclusions. But there is a unanimity of agreement that the problems involved in the social, religious, industrial and political unrest of to-day must be met by the Church and measurably solved by the Church. Moreover, there is a growing conviction that the Church of to-day is fully as able to define truth and to express truth as was the Church of yesterday; and that Religion, whatever its garb, must be dynamic and not static.

We shall address ourselves somewhat definitely to a survey of some of these problems. We shall endeavor to present certain angles of vision and, perchance, to develop some of the points of contact which the Church clearly has with the problems of life and of labor—the problems which seemingly make for a re-articulation of the Church with the order of to-day.

There are certain fundamentals to which we must hold irrevocably as believers in the social application of religion. These are, in short, the basic essentials that are held by the churches in common. We believe absolutely in the individual type of salvation, yet have we not come to the point where we are obliged to regard it as but fractional, as preliminary to that comprehensive type of salvation which gathers within its widening circle all of those institutions and relations of life which "social salvation" comprehends? Social religion would project itself as a transforming regenerating, vitalizing force into all those king-

doms that we would acclaim as "kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ.

Social service implies servants. Social service through the Church can be rendered only by servants of God. Therefore, we must believe that in order to apply the gospel of Jesus Christ to society, one must know the gospel as it is in and through Christ. This involves nothing less than knowing Christ; knowing Him not alone as the Great Dynamic of the world, but as personal Saviour, Redeemer, Friend.

It is not enough to know that while "many great men have deeply affected the history of the world", yet "Jesus Christ has changed the fundamental nature of society." The effective social servant in the gospel's ministry must know Jesus as a personal, actuating force in his own life.

Social religion would not declare a new gospel, nor advocate a new code of Christian ethics. Nor is it within the thought to suggest any radical application of the gospel, nor any startling change in the function of the Church. For if the social application of religion is not of the warp and woof of the gospel, if the salvation of man does not comprehend a wholeness as perfect as the seamless robe of Christ, and if social religion was not plainly set forth in the teaching and the ministry of the Master, it would have no appeal to us, nor could we justify our advocacy of it.

Here is the situation which we face—we who bear this social message: The social conscience of the Church is not yet aroused. It is still the aim of the Church to effect the salvation of the individual—which, we all agree, is of surpassing importance—in the fond belief that the saved individual will create the good society. It cannot be maintained that any denomination as such has committed itself to the formulating, much less the working out, of any program which social service involves.

True, there have been social pronouncements that have issued from the councils of government of several of the large communions, but for the most part they have been negative in character. Moreover, they have treated of the larger problems of the social unrest, and have not approached, nor indicated, the line leading to the solution of these problems. Nor do these pronouncements, in the main, show the point of contact which the local church has with these problems.

Notwithstanding the truly significant fact that thirty of the

denominations have united as a Federal Council of Churches, and through that Council have issued a statement of social faith, setting forth the social aims of which these churches approve, and likewise giving emphasis to the unsocial tendencies of which they disapprove, yet the essential fact remains that thus far there has been no church-wide movement in any of the denominations towards the social application of religion. In fine, the definite, specific, practical program of social advance has not yet been formulated by the Church.

Individual leaders within the various communions have caught the vision of a comprehensive, whole-life application of religion, kingdom-embracing in its scope, modernly evangelistic in its principles, and are associating themselves together with the end in view, of communicating, and of actualizing, this full-orbed conception of the gospel's mission. And it is noteworthy that it is the pulpit, not the pew; the clergyman, not the layman, who has caught this vision. Let us make clear, at this juncture, our utter disagreement with those critics of the Church who would have us believe that the pulpit is reactionary and that the pew alone is progressive.

However, it cannot be said that this new leaven has yet begun to exercise its potency. Therefore, the churches of no denomination, nor even the several churches of any considerable section, can be said to be seeking broadly to apply religion to the associated life of men.

When we approach the men and women of the Church we discover immediately that social service itself is quite generally misunderstood. The mere suggestion of the term, due mainly to the adjective, calls to mind Socialism; and, unfortunately, that raw type of Socialism, unlettered and largely misrepresentative, which is usually vehicled by the man on the soap box. At the very outset, therefore, we have both a misunderstanding and a confusion of terms. We recall the statement of a venerable gentleman to the effect that social service had been a feature of his church for over fifty years; that regularly at Thanksgiving Christmas, New Year's and Easter baskets of food and gifts of clothing were generously and graciously distributed among the poor and needy. There is a sense in which this is, to be sure, a type of social service, altogether of a restricted and remedial character. And a ludicrous association of the term is with din-

ners, bazaars, and other sociable occasions where, quite often, the percentage of profit lifts itself from the ground of simple arithmetic into the domain of high finance.

We need at the outset, therefore, a definition of social service, as distinguished from individual service. May we suggest this:

That while individual service, or that which has been common to the Church for ages past and which must ever be a basic function of the Church, will teach people how to live good lives, social service works for the establishment of proper conditions in which to live good lives.

Individual service will relieve poverty; social service seeks to remove the cause of poverty. Individual service, prompted by a perfectly proper motive, which may be altruistic or may be that of self-protection, would abolish the danger of infection from disease or vice in one's own house or block. To remove this danger from the community or the town is social service.

The adjective "social" is the more important word of the term, for there is a great variety of service: To one's family, to one's Church, to one's political party, to one's friends; from service that includes only a few to that which embraces many in its touch.

Social service, therefore, is essentially service to society as a group-society; not only to men, women and children as members of society, but to society in its sociological sense.

Social service through the Church has for its immediate object the application of the gospel to the associated life of men. It is in no manner a substitute for individual service, nor is it the alternative to individual service. It involves the definite projection of religion into all the realms of human life and all the relations of man's being. It contemplates the salvation of the whole man. It seeks nothing less than the Christianization of all the institutions of life. It is the religion that saves and the religion that serves, as well as the religion that keeps, expressing itself in social terms. Its perfect goal is a saved soul. in a saved body, in a saved environment.

The social service movement, we believe, is due to the larger and truer appreciation which we have to-day of the Gospel as a solvent for the problems of modern life. It squares absolutely with the program of Jesus Christ. It derives its inspiration, gains its incentive, from Him who ministered to the sick and

the needy, the oppressed and the outcast, and who had thought for the life here, and the settling of that life—its environment, as well as the life to come.

Social salvation involves all that individual and personal regeneration implies, and it is obliged to realize that social reconstruction, unfortunately, does not necessarily follow individual redemption. This, in fact, is a chief point of emphasis to-day as social service advances.

Social service does not carry with it any new code of Christian ethics, nor does it advocate any change in the function of the Church. It does not suggest that the pulpit should be converted into a forum for the discussion, as a rule, of sociology, economics or politics. It is not a veneered heterodoxy, nor is the other cynical suggestion, that one must be theologically heterodox in order to be socially orthodox, worthy of any serious consideration.

Salvation to-day must involve the complete man in all of that man's relations, else it is not adequately effective. And it may be suggested here that it would seem to be a greater achievement to save a man to-day, even to encompass the exclusively individual type of salvation, because of the abstractions and distractions of our involved modern life, than ever before.

Goodness and inefficiency have too long been yoked together in the Church, and alert Christians are dissatisfied with the one-sided, fractional salvation that produces merely good men. The thing needed to-day in increasing measure is good men who can make good.

A saved soul makes a man good, and a good man makes his surroundings better—which is just half the truth; but a saved soul, in a saved body, in a saved community, in a saved environment—there is the whole truth.

Social service would function the Church with the community, with the city, in efficient degree. But the Church would not seek to assume the function of the city.

We who proclaim the social gospel are among those who hold to the conviction that the Church alone can never establish the kingdom of God in this world. There are critics of the Church, and they are quite numerous in these days, who seek to maintain that it is the business of the Church to do everything from directing politics and guiding industry and purifying the government at home, to establishing a monetary unit for the world.

We take decided issue with those who profess to entertain this belief.

The Church to-day really shares its function with other institutions, and to us it seems that society can never be saved and the kingdom of God founded here in this earth, in and through the Church alone. Shall we not hold this to be a perfectly logical conclusion, flowing as it does from an analysis of the function of the Church? But it may be that we are not in entire accord as to the function of the Church, and some may hold that the Church and the Kingdom of God are co-terminous. Others, we know, believe that the Church is the only divine institution on earth.

Do we not rightly maintain that the will and purpose of God are expressed through three great institutions—the Family, the Church and the State; and that each is a medium through which God is working out His plans for the redemption of the world? And that each of these institutions has separate and distinct functions? And that in the proper exercise of these functions the motive is religious?

Is it not right, moreover, for us to declare that these functions, all religious, are of such a fundamental nature as to make them complementary, corresponding, and, in a sense, interlocking—the function of the Family with that of the Church and State; the function of the Church with that of the Family and State; the function of the State with that of the Family and Church?

Each seeks to realize the ideals of the kingdom that correspond to its function; to have them expressed in human lives and fulfilled in human relations. These three institutions, (shall we not say of divine origin?) “are the media through which the life of the kingdom actualizes itself in the world.” It must follow, therefore, that they are the three co-ordinating factors in the work of establishing the kingdom of God on the earth.

Let us define these institutions with especial regard to salient functions and in terms of the kingdom of God. Here are the definitions of the Family, the Church and the State, of Professor Samuel Zane Batten:¹

“The Family is the institute of love and trust. Its special function is to mould the life of the kingdom, to be a school of

1 “The Social Task.”

self-sacrifice and mutual aid, and then to send forth its members to seek through the family the perfection of the race and to serve as good citizens in the civic state.

"The Church is the institute of faith and hope. Its special function is to testify of God and His kingdom, to hold up the Christian ideal in the sight of all men, to inform the mind, to arouse the conscience of the people, to hearten them for courageous living, and to send them forth thus taught, inspired and impelled, to hunger after justice, to seek the kingdom and its righteousness, and to build on earth a Christian social order.

"The State is the institute of rights and duties. Its special function is to maintain justice in human relations, to seek after righteousness in society, to provide the conditions for human, moral and spiritual life, to embody in its order the abiding principles of the kingdom—righteousness and peace in the Holy Spirit—and to send forth its citizens to hallow God's name, to seek His kingdom, and to do His will in all the masterful institutions of their social and political life."

Let us at once recognize the fact that these definitions are incomplete; that none is comprehensive. The functions of Family, Church and State are given in idealistic, rather than practical terms. But the chief aim of each institution is lucidly indicated.

While there is a sense in which we are concerned primarily with the Church as the great instrument for the establishment of the kingdom of God in the world, yet any fair consideration must take cognizance of all cardinal contributing factors. That which we seek, the ultimate goal, in so far as this world is concerned, is the Christianization of the institutions of man's life—that in all their expressions they may be motivated by religion—and their enlistment in the work of social redemption.

To this end, therefore, we must validate the worth of the Family and the State as related agencies, with the Church, for aiding the Church towards the perfect exercises of her function.

We shall endeavor to define the kingdom of God, to locate it in workable terms of to-day. Christ, we know, gave us no definition of it, but He described it many times; and in the Sermon on the Mount He has indicated very plainly the kind and quality of the social order He expected to see established.

"The kingdom of God," says Professor Batten,² "is a great comprehensive ideal. It is a personal good and it is a social state. It is a good in time and it is no less a good in eternity. It is a universal fact, the reign of God throughout His whole creation; and it is the realization under the conditions of time and space of the eternal purpose of God."

Then, with greater definiteness: "The kingdom of God is the reign of God in men and over men and through men. It comprehends the whole life of man and makes provision for all his needs. It is a society of men who do God's will and fulfill His righteousness. It includes the whole being and destiny of man, and binds heaven and earth, time and eternity, God and man together in a solidarity of life and blessedness."

And in the more specific social terms of our time: "The Kingdom of God is a great social synthesis which includes the whole life of man—spiritual, moral, mental and physical. Its field of manifestation is man's personal, family, social, political and industrial relations. It finds its consummation, so far as this world is concerned, in a righteous and brotherly society on earth. In fine, it is a good for the whole man in this world and in every world.

"The kingdom of God is the growing perfection of the collective life of humanity. It is the redemption of man's mental, moral and physical life. It means a perfect man in a perfect society."

In "The Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Life," Dr. King says, "Religion is not something apart from life, but in the very midst of it; knit up with cell and with sex, with human relations and employments and tendencies and strivings—inextricably involved in all. And we should look for its glory not in majestic isolation, but rather in its ability to permeate and dominate all life."

While we have said that the whole work of the kingdom cannot be done in and through the Church alone, yet the thought must not be suggested that the Church is not supremely and vitally important in the work of social regeneration. The organized Church of Jesus Christ must receive the loyalty of all Christians. Her function and methods must never be mini-

2 "The Social Task of Christianity," Batten.

mized. And if we have correctly interpreted the spirit and purpose of this movement towards social Christianity, it involves nothing less than the positive magnifying of the Church, and her functioning anew upon a larger plane of service.

But the four-square program of Christianity, the entire work of the kingdom, simply cannot be actualized by the Church alone. If this were not true there would be the implication that the Church arrogated to herself the functions of the Family and State.

Has the time not come, therefore, for men and women to have full appreciation of the divine significance and the religious value of the Family and State? That conception gained, must it not follow that these more neglected institutions shall be consciously and collectively utilized in behalf of religious progress and social redemption?

The social problems which press so heavily upon us for solution are not alone problems which the Church must solve because of the divine origin, *per se*, of the Church, or because of the peculiar function and powers residing in the Church, but the Church must contribute largely to the solution of these problems because through her work they have been created. Not this alone, but the Evangelical Christian Church has, on final analysis, actually brought these problems upon us.

We shall accord to the Roman Catholic Church glad recognition of all the virtue she possesses, but may we call attention to the fact that there are no problems of social advance of which the people are markedly conscious in any of the lands where Roman Catholicism holds sway.

For instance, are there social problems such as we have in the United States, such as there are in England or in Germany, in any of the South American countries? What social problems are there in Austria? Moreover, there were no social problems of national magnitude in France, or Portugal, or Spain, until the clutch of the Romanist system was broken.

Evangelical Christianity, our "wayfaring" Christianity, is alone responsible for these problems, and is called of God to solve them. Christianity of this type has exalted manhood throughout the world, has enhanced his value, broadened his horizon, magnified his importance, enlarged his field of opportunity. As some one has said, "If proof were needed it would

be found in the fact that the greatest changes—the things indeed which make modern civilization—are found precisely at the points which Jesus Christ most strongly pressed.”

Another has said that “The transition from barbarism to civilization takes place, not by the improvement of means of transportation, or facilities for commerce, or discoveries of science, or wonders of invention— though these are valuable by-products of the stimulating energy of religion—but by the diffusion of faith in God’s fatherhood and man’s brotherhood, and by the most practical application of these truths to everyday affairs.”

Religion has produced an upward pressure on human society. Dynamic Christianity has pressed most strongly upon the peoples of the evangelized, modernized, democratized, lands, and this pressure to-day is as the working of leaven in our social fabric. Christ’s exaltation of manhood and womanhood has involved a re-standardization, a re-valuation of humanity, which is now expressed in the growing social consciousness of the people. Issuing from this, logically, is the social problem.

“Religion,” said a distinguished bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, “has outgrown the Church.” He avers, moreover, that there is a decided conflict between Religion and the Church. Religion is becoming democratized—and the pity is that the Church fails to appreciate this significant trend.

Have our old terms lost their potency, our old methods their effectiveness? Shall we not record, also, that our time-honored policies somehow fail to bring results commensurate with the tremendous volume of effort expended, and shall we not say that the message which appealed to our fathers does not yield the fulness of response from this generation?

Be this as it may, there is none among us who will question that the power of God unto salvation still remains, or that the grip of God on the life of man is after all the one cohesive element that holds society from chaos.

Religion, we aver, is not in the melting pot. But does not the conviction force itself that some of our methods of expressing it, of interpreting it, are even now in the crucible? A new die is to be cast? A new vehicle for its transmission is to come? A new channel through which it shall flow is being prepared?

The era of social Christianity is upon us. With it comes the

democratization of religion. And religion will not function on the low plane of materialism, as the Socialists would have us believe. The Brotherhood of Man will come only through the operation of the processes which God set in motion from the beginning of the world. Men must become sons before they can become brothers—sons of God, and brothers through God's Son.

Socialism errs fundamentally when it proclaims that the betterment of religious, social and economic conditions is to come from the physical and material benefit alone of the so-called "proletariat." Constructive reform, abiding reform, will come only in measure as education is democratized and as man gains a new appreciation of manhood through religion—for education is rooted in religion.

"Intense poverty, bearing the sordid fruits—pauperism, crime, vice, sickness, premature death—does not make for democratic reform," says Dr. Weyl.³ "A really effective discontent accompanies a larger income, a fuller education, a greater leisure, and a vision of better things.

"The hope of society lies not in the oppression of men to the verge of revolt, but in the continuous elimination of oppression. The hunger of the multitude is not the true motive of revolution. Hunger degenerates, insecurity of life leads to crime, and these, by enfeebling their victims, strengthen the oppressive bonds and make them perpetual. A man, or a class, crushed to earth—is crushed to earth."

In these days the Church is gaining appreciation of certain essential facts: That salvation is something more than assurance of life hereafter; that it is not an end in itself, but merely a means to an end. That in saving the body there is implied no disparagement of the soul. That "come ye out from among them and be ye separate" must no longer be given the monastic interpretation. That the Church has ceased to be a city of refuge. That salvation is not limited to a single realm of life, or a single aspect of being, but that it encompasses the utter totality of life.

A recent writer, of the Church, has criticised the Church because its plans and, in generations past, its very ideals, have been personal—which is to say denominational and ecclesiastical, and

3 *The New Democracy*, Weyl.

because most of the programs began and ended with the Church. Whether this criticism is just and the implied censure deserved is not a matter for final judgment at this time, but it would seem that there is abundant evidence in support of the criticism. It is true that many leaders of the Church have had a wider vision, a larger program, and have sought a greater field for achievement than that offered by the Church and that which denomination-serving has involved. But so far as the rank and file of the Church is concerned there has not always been expressed the thought that Christianity had another and a greater object than to "draw out of the world the Lord's elect and preserve them against the time of the Lord's return." The parable of the leaven failed to receive its widest application. The injunction of James, to keep oneself "unspotted from the world," was taken quite literally. Piety and righteousness were regarded as synonymous terms.

And the programs of the Church relating to social reform have failed of their purpose to a large degree because of their lack of the constructive element. The Church has been "for" too little that concerns the life here and "against" too much; so the negative and destructive have featured the plans and programs of the Church. So in its treatment of social evils the ministration has been to effects, rather than to causes, and apparently without realization of the basic fact that social ills have their root in social causes. The attempt at cure, praiseworthy though it has been, was along individualistic rather than social lines.

In a consideration of the Church and Social Reform, Dr. Cochran of Philadelphia, summed up his argument in a short sentence. "The world," he said, "will not be satisfied with our religious professions until we attack the causes of poverty and disease with the same enthusiasm and persistency that we palliate the symptoms."

But the newer thought of the Church to-day grasps all this and it locates the root in social maladjustments of the effects which we term sickness, poverty, crime, inefficiency and injustice in the associated, the corporate, life. So elimination of these evils will come, not through individual action, but through social action. With this thought dominating, the impossibility of isolated reforms will be more apparent.

Shall we apply this principle to the slum? The slum roots

in a social maladjustment. The older thought of the Church expressed itself in the establishing of rescue halls as a means of redeeming the slum—and these rescue missions have done a glorious work. They will ever be necessary, so long as the slum exists. Their importance as factors in encompassing the redemption of the fallen and the outcast should never be minimized. But they are missions to the individual, and for the saving of the individual. And so it may be stated in all truth that were these rescue halls multiplied many times, and were they to operate to the utter limit of their capacity, and accomplish the redeeming work to which they were sent, the slum would still persist. For while these halls were rescuing men and women one by one, yet the conditions which produce the slum would remain untouched. Boys and girls, young men and young women, would still be growing up in demoralizing surroundings, exposed to all manner of evil suggestions, often robbed of the rights of childhood and youth, prematurely worked, under nourished, contacted with adult vice, and forming habits in the plastic days that take a fatal set upon them. Thus is the slum recruited, not from within, but from without.

The cure for the slum, therefore, with all that the slum suggests, is the utter annihilation of the conditions that perpetuate the slum, and these conditions are not altogether found in the slum itself. This applies likewise to the saloon and the gambling house and the brothel.

Social evils, therefore, have social causes. Eradication must be along social and not individual lines. Which is not to say that individual effort is to be stopped or its value lessened.

It has been well said that there is no such thing either conceivable or possible as a good individual who is good by himself and unto himself. John Wesley declared that the Bible "knows nothing of a solitary religion." Man is a being of relations, and right life is life in right relations. Therefore the man who is good at all is good in the relations in which he finds himself. In fine, religion itself is an aggregate of relationships.

"Christianity must not alone make good individuals," as Professor Batten says, "but it must point the way and indicate the manner in which these individuals shall associate themselves in righteous social relations. Mere honesty and uprightness in the personal life is not enough; there must be the incarnation of

honesty and uprightness in social, political and economic laws and systems."

Christ organized two missionary tours, giving to the missionaries certain definite instructions which were identically the same in each case. And the missionaries, upon their return, reported to Christ that they had carried out his orders.

Christ went into the Nazarene synagogue and deliberately turned to the writings of the Prophet Isaiah, from which He read, "The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon me; because Jehovah hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound....to comfort all that mourn....to give unto them a garland for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness."

Five thousand men, besides women and children, had followed him all the day. They had heard his words of life. Travel worn and hungry they were. The disciples would send them away. Had they not listened to some of the greatest discourses that the world ever had heard? Ought that not to satisfy them? The Master thought not. And He gave to them the bread and the meat that they required to appease their physical hunger. He ministered to their bodies.

John the Baptist was in prison. He sent to Christ and asked for proofs of Christ's divinity. And the Master sent to John these proofs: "The blind receive their sight and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them."

And so the record of His ministry, fragmentary though it is, evidences the application, in concrete cases, of His whole-life conception of service. He clearly showed that it was His mission beneficently to influence the whole life of man.

The Christian, therefore, who would deny that religion is concerned about a man's health and his labor, about a man's food and his clothing, about his welfare and his surroundings, has a problem which he must settle in the light of the life, the program and the practices of the Christ who served.

What then, shall we ask, is the task of the Church, and just where is the place of the Church in the changing order of to-day,

or where does the Church function with the so-called secular agencies that are making for human advance?

"The Church is to arouse and inspire men to go forth and make justice prevail in the earth. It is not enough to cherish the ideals of justice, but a collective effort must be made to reduce these ideals to practice. This will mean that men instructed and inspired by the Church are to go forth and testify militantly against all injustice, to withstand every wrong wherever found, to expose every falsehood without fear or favor, and to seek to ensure each man his due.

"This means further that men of the Church are to make a collective effort to establish justice in the daily practice of the commercial world and to build up in the earth a just and Christian industrial order. That is, they must seek to secure for every person the conditions of a fair and human life in society. They must see that gains received and privileges enjoyed bear some proportion to services rendered and obligations fulfilled. They must put their faith and practice and conscience in pledge in behalf of a just and Christian social order. They must strive together to establish justice as the supreme law and the daily practice of all men in all the relations of life.

"For is not the search for justice primary and fundamental? And is it not in vain to talk of a Christian civilization or to expect a Christian society without justice being expressed all along the line? This is not to say that justice is to be the only object of the Christian's efforts, but that it is both primary and fundamental."⁴

A German scholar has said that "Whosoever would contribute to the solution of the social question must have on his right hand the works on political economy and before him must be kept open the New Testament."

The Church must concern itself with the Socialist Movement, perhaps the most significant movement of these times. The Church cannot ignore it. Socialism is the avowed creed of millions of men and women, and if the statements of many of its leaders are to be accepted at face value, Socialism is utterly opposed to the organized Church of Christ, but, paradoxically, declares itself to be in accord with the Spirit of Christ.

⁴ Social Task of Christianity, Batten.

Socialism must be reckoned with, and the fact that its propaganda expresses many errors is all the more reason why the Church should deal with it—considerately, graciously and helpfully. For Socialism, like heterodoxy, shows that people are actually thinking along original lines, and for themselves, and it may be put forth almost as axiomatic that heterodoxy on fire is better than orthodoxy on ice. Moreover, the Socialist is able to give a reason for the faith that is within him.

What connection should the Church have with social agencies that are classified as "secular"—Charity Organization Societies, Child Labor Committees, Labor Unions, Welfare Leagues, Playground Associations, and the like? It will not do merely to say that the "inspiration" for these movements comes from the Church, for the Church almost without exception characterizes these as non-religious, and declares that they are motivated by a "professionalism" that is cold, callous and heartless; that the genuine religious element is lacking in their work. There is a "professionalism" of which the Church, too, is guilty. Nevertheless, this attitude will not tend to hasten the solution of the problems that should be quite common to the Church and the "secular" humanitarian societies. Perhaps the most cruel and unjust assertion ever made against social workers in the so-called "professional" field was that "they worshipped a statistical Christ." And to our shame it was said by a leader in the Church. There cannot, of course, be any understanding between the Church and the social workers, whose efforts are expended through institutions other than the Church, if this spirit is to prevail. The Church should no longer apologize for the social agencies for which she is, after all, responsible.

Exactly what is the situation in which the Church finds itself to-day in the cities, not alone of the United States, but of Great Britain and the Continent? Scores, even hundreds of churches there are in our cities, each moving along its own little independent course, each fighting its own battle,—and shall we not say that the fight is a brave and an heroic one?—each in its own fashion seeking the salvation of the fractional man, and each praying and working for the coming of the kingdom of God of its own circumscribed conception. And that kingdom, if it did come, would by the logic of the process employed in creating it be nothing more than an anarchy of good individuals. It must

be a great confederation, a complete amalgamation of wholly saved men and women, whose very method of salvation gravitated them towards a full-orbed social realm wherein all parts co-ordinated in producing the perfection of a universal Christian synthesis.

But with all of our city churches and all of our millions of city church members there has thus far been no Christian cause in the city and for the city. In no large way has there been unity of effort. Church federations usually are on paper. In no large way has there been a marshalling of forces. In no large way has there been a definite and workable plan of campaign, nor in any large way has there been a utilization, in leagued, coalesced form, of the resources of Christ's Church in behalf of the common good and towards a single, social, common end.

If we would hold that a Divine Providence from time to time exalts certain great truths and indicates them as stress points for the collective effort of His people, who is there that dares say that Almighty God has not indicated for the churches of this day the application, by the churches in federation, of the Gospel of His Son to society—to men and women in the bulk; to the conditions that surround them; to the systems that at times so cruelly moil them; to the forces that so tragically engulf them?

Is the program which Christ gave centuries ago not as applicable to-day as in ages past? Nay, do we not hold that it is more efficacious now—because of our larger intelligence, our greater light, our modern equipment, our consecrated sagacity, our wealth of experience? The message of Christ is as fresh to-day as though it had been handed down from the Throne of God this very morning. Are we the ones who should ask, even in our moments of dull discouragement, whether Christianity after all has not failed? After we have looked upon the awful handicap which Christianity has in the cities? Shall we not put to ourselves instead, the question whether Christianity, the abundant, comprehensive Christianity, has really ever been tried in all its fullness?

Where are the parishes to-day in our great cities? Do they really exist? What has the Church in Philadelphia, or New York, or Boston, or Chicago, beyond a membership roll? And while those on that roll are nurtured and cared for,—and sometimes coddled—is it not true that the great mass of the people

are unchurched—that they are easy victims to every scheme that would exploit them? Why should we marvel at the spread of an anti-Church Socialism?

What is the Church in the city doing to-day in that immense twilight zone that is to be found between the membership roster of your church and the membership roster of my church? Does the Church even speak the language of this multitude?

Where is the parish of any one of the eight hundred churches of Philadelphia? Is there one section of that city for which a single church holds itself directly and wholly responsible?

What triumphant message has the Church which the people hear? In what direction are her energies expended? Are they not too often dissipated in preaching and working against the various minor evils—in campaigning against Sunday athletics, Sunday concerts, Sunday picture shows—the amusements of the poor?

And does the pulpit carry a message of conviction of the sin of Child Labor, of the sin of unsanitary housing, of the sin of underpaying and overworking women? Does the pulpit seek to convict of these corporate sins?

We speak of efficiency. Of what use is it unless there be a worth-while objective. Efficiency of itself is nothing. But efficiency illumined by a vision in which is lined the radiant structure of the kingdom of God, the dwelling place of social justice—that is efficiency to a purpose.

The Church must get back to the people. The dallying with symptoms, the offering of classes and calisthenics and cookery, the expenditure of tremendous energy towards the suppression of minor evils, the attitude of employing the negative to the amusements of the people when those amusements are not in the direction of our orthodox conceptions—as though these dwellers in the twilight zone knew our angle of vision; all these things indicate efficiency as going to the bad.

What do people who are underpaid and underfed and overworked and who stifle in noisome tenements, owned too often by church members, care for our orthodoxy? Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?

Shed the clerical vest and collar, put off the frock coat and get into the fustian of the people who live in the warrens of the

congested sections, and quiz the first denizen you meet as to how he looks at the Church.

"The Church," he says, "why, the Church is not for the likes of us. All we know about the Church is that it is forever 'butting in' and trying to take away the little pleasure we have left. It is forever kicking about Sunday baseball and Sunday shows and Sunday concerts. But it never does anything about bad housing and tuberculosis and homeless girls and underpaid women and overworked children. The Church! Why, it's doing a boy's work in a man's world. That's all we know about the Church here."

We must analyze the fact that the city is overchurched and that the churches are underworked. We must come to know exactly what this means. We must get a vision of social justice. We must minister not alone to the poor and the oppressed and the exploited, but we must seek to do our share to eradicate the causes that make for poverty and oppression and exploitation. Poverty can be stamped out. Christ did not say, "The poor ye *must* have always with you."

There is one tendency which we would suggest for further thought. There are some who regard it as an indication that Christian wealth does not have the same confidence in the Church as an almoner that it had 25 or 50 years ago. It is the tendency on the part of wealthy men to distribute their wealth more largely in the interest of non-church than of Church agencies. Here are some facts that are worthy of consideration:

During the past ten or twelve years the inconceivably enormous sum of over a billion of dollars has been given away by Americans for various benevolent and philanthropic purposes. Of this stupendous amount relatively little went to the Church. The millionaires of to-day who profess allegiance to the Church and who declare that they give from a religious motive and with a religious impulse, dole out small sums to the support of Church enterprises, but give in kingly measure to philanthropic, humanitarian and educational institutions that are seeking the general betterment and social uplift of the people.

A careful investigator noted, also, that not only the dollars of the rich but the pennies of the poor have been diverted in a large measure from the Church, and he says, "No one can study cursorily the Socialistic movement, the Trades Union movement,

and the spread of fraternal and mutual benefit societies without being impressed with the great sums, in the aggregate, which are being given yearly to maintain these movements."

It is not that religious impulses are not prompting the giving of great wealth for the furtherance of religious objectives, but it is that institutions other than the Church are being made the beneficiaries and administrators of this benevolence.

It may be noted also that this giving would seem to indicate a growing realization on the part of the donors that the Church to-day really shares her function with other institutions, and that the social aims of religion can be better carried out by secular institutions.

Here are just a few of the reasons given by men of commanding position for the lack of the fullest measure of confidence in the Church:

The multiplication of churches, the duplication of exactly corresponding agencies, the disproportion of results to energy expended, the utilization of an expensive plant but one day in seven, the lack of a program for to-morrow, the negative, palliative program of social reform, the absence of the constructive element in plans and methods, the annihilation of energy through supine, apathetic Christians, with their tendency towards the *laissez faire* idea. It must not be thought that those who advance this criticism are assuming for a moment that the Church is moribund, but with one accord they insist that the Church is ailing.

These same strictures are even now being passed upon the non-church philanthropic and humanitarian agencies, where the duplication and overlapping and the useless expenditure of energy and money are notably marked. In one of the large cities, where the perplexing problem of adjusting the immigrant to a new environment is not even in course of solution, there are more than 300 agencies or societies dabbling in the situation.

A sweeping indictment has been brought against the social agencies by Professor Dealey, who says:

"There is a sense...in which it might be maintained that our numerous social reforms are doing more harm than good. Persons engaged in them are often so busily occupied with special phases that the situation as a whole has been neglected, and waste in time, money and energy become inevitable.....

One would not be rash in saying that the waste through social vices is to a considerable extent duplicated by the waste due to the defective and competing methods of religious, moral and social agencies in reform."⁵

Right here, therefore, is indicated an opportunity for the Church, with its gospel of wholeness, to render a service which is imperatively demanded in these days of emphasis upon scientific management, standardization and efficiency.

The problem of the city staggers thoughtful Christians throughout the world. It is, indeed, a world problem, but it is withal particularly keen in America. Within the last ten years the population of the United States increased 21 per cent. The cities having a population of 25,000 and over increased 55 per cent. during the same decade. The tendency of population is towards the city the world over. The membership of the Church in the United States increased, during the decade, 21 per cent., but the Church is losing ground in the city.

The city problem must be viewed from two points—our own angle and that of the foreigner, especially the Asiatic. We have knowledge of the harrowing conditions that are to be found in the so-called heathen cities of Asia. The stereopticon of the furloughed missionary visualizes them to our churches. It is a fact, also, and one to which we are not always inclined to attach due importance, that the Asiatic likewise has knowledge of the distressing conditions that exist in our so-called Christian cities. For do not our magazines and other periodicals portray to him the shame of American cities?

Are we willing that the Asiatic shall gauge the efficacy of our Christian religion by the conditions which we tolerate in the cities of Christendom? Shall we consent that the Oriental shall measure the power and value of Christianity by the conditions existing in London and Liverpool, Hamburg and Paris, Boston and New York, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Chicago and San Francisco? Whether we are willing that this test should be applied, the fact remains that the Asiatic traveler in Christian lands is judging the worth, the utility, of Christianity by its manifestation, or its lack of manifestation, in our cities.

The city problem is not only the heaviest handicap which

5 Sociology, Dealey.

Christianity has to bear at home, but it reacts upon the work of Christian missionaries in foreign lands. In these days the Asiatic reads the papers of Europe and America. He has a fairly accurate idea of the meaning of the East End of London and of the East Side of New York. In fact, our enterprising newspapers and pictorial sheets have vividly shown him the purlieus of our great cities.

The up-to-date Asiatic, and his tribe is increasing, largely because of the spread of the civilization which we term Christian. He knows Tammany Hall and what it stands for; he knows of the partnership of the police and the criminals in New York and other large American cities; he knows how vice is commercialized in America, and he knows, too, of the municipal corruption that existed in Philadelphia, Chicago, Denver and San Francisco. He knows, moreover, of the Pittsburgh Survey and what it revealed. Is it not possible that he has asked himself whether these are indications of the inefficiency of Christianity, and that if Christianity cannot make better cities at home why he should consider it as in any manner an improvement upon or a substitute for the religions of India, China, Japan or even the Mohammedan lands?

The average city dweller knows little of conditions in his own city, and it is indeed rare that he has personal knowledge of the city slum. The city man wears a daily path from his home to his office and thence to his home, and the only deviations therefrom are caused by occasional side trips to the club or the theater or the railway station. One would not need to trifle with the truth to state that, to a measureable degree, the slum exists, that it persists, because of the self-complacency of the city dweller.

In making these statements it is not intended to imply that city serving has not been in the program of the Christian, or that great things have not been done in past generations by the men and women of the churches, or that progress has not been made. Far from it; nevertheless, the fact remains that the methods thus far followed have not saved our cities. We must go now in search of a more adequate plan—one that will deal with causes.

If the slum and the underworld are unknown, except by hearsay, to the city dweller, how much less are they known to the people of the smaller towns? Speaking generally, they have no idea of what congestion of population actually means, and in

their sight-seeing tours when in the city their range of vision rarely extends beyond the brick walls that envelop the awful sordidness within.

A few years ago New York State created a special commission to investigate the tenement house situation in New York City. After some days spent in first-hand inquiry in the midst of the inferno of the East Side the up-State members of the Commission, who had viewed the conditions with repugnance, amazement, horror, disgust and utter humiliation, united in a statement in which they said, "New York City itself ought to be abolished." In other words a city which would permit the existence of conditions which are found on the East Side is a disgrace to civilization and should be blotted out. These up-State-men had known of the slum, but had never before realized the slum.

The development of the American slum has reached a point which causes many people unconsciously, but none the less actually, to view it as an asset. The slum is capitalized. Some of us boast about it, as we would of Niagara or Yellow Stone. Just what does it signify when owners of sight-seeing automobiles will have the audacity to protest to a city government against cleaning out of Chinatown? "You are injuring our business," they said in New York not long ago. Consider the fight that the decent authorities of San Francisco are now having to prevent those who would exploit the slum and underworld from recreating the infamous Barbary Coast after the hand of God, as manifested by the earthquake and the fire, had laid it in dust and ashes.

England no longer minimizes the danger of the slum. She has had her Boer War, and England knows too well that the reason for her virtual defeat by the Boers was found in White-chapel and Stepney and the other hovel-filled sections of London's East End, where were bred the anemic, the tubercular, the inefficient. Material here for an army? Perish the thought!

Huxley had spent some years in London's slums. Later he went to Africa where he saw the life of the raw savage, and he said, "I saw nothing worse there, nothing more degrading, nothing so hopeless, nothing so intolerably dull and miserable, as the life I left behind me in the East End of London; and had I to choose between the life of these people in the East End of Lon-

don and the life of the savage, I would distinctly choose the latter."

He said that London ought to be abolished, but he said it in these words: "If there is no hope of a large improvement of the condition of the human family I would hail the advent of some kindly comet which would sweep the whole affair away as a desirable consummation."

Bryden, a traveler and social observer, visited Bechuanaland, and declared, "I say unhesitatingly that these people are at this moment physically and morally better off than thousands of the population of our great cities in Great Britain, living happier and healthier lives by far than seven-tenths of the poor folks at home."

Tennyson, too, knew of the slum, for he wrote in "Locksley Hall Sixty Years After:"

Is it well that while we range with science, glorying in the time,
City children soil and blacken soul and sense in city slime?

There among the glooming alleys progress halts on palsied feet,
Crime and hunger cast our maidens by the thousand on the street;

There the master scrimps his haggard sempstress of her daily bread,

There a single, sordid attic holds the living and the dead.

There the smoldering fires of fever creeps across the rotted floor
And the crowded couch of incest, in the warrens of the poor.

And Dr. Walter Weyl, in "The New Democracy," says this of our present-day American slum: "Our worst slums are not as hopeless as the slough of Whitechapel, or the horrid slums of English towns, where literally rot the descendants of Crecy and Poitiers. The poverty even of our most destitute Negroes is opulence compared with the bottomless pit of misery of South Italy or Russia. The enormous wealth of the Continent, and our long immunity from war, lessened our pauperism and held up even our lowest standards of living to a point where they annually attracted and still attract hundreds of thousands of immigrants. Many of our poorer city wards are not slums at all in the European sense. They are not cesspools of society, into which the hopeless human refuse inextricably sinks, but are rather trying-out stations, out of which are promoted rising im-

migrants, who have survived the corroding experiences of the first years of American life."

We shall not agree with some of the characterizations and conclusions of Dr. Weyl. We have been in rather intimate touch with the American slum into which "the hopeless human refuse inextricably sinks," and we bear glad testimony that the power of God extends efficaciously to those who are sinking in this human wreckage, and it brings them back to the secure anchorage of faith and hope, and sets them in the way of life. The redeeming, reconstructive, rehabilitating gospel of Christ is the one solvent of slum conditions—but it must be applied to prevent, as well as to reclaim.

Continuing, Dr. Weyl says, "Nevertheless, we have slums—pauper slums and criminal slums, the heirlooms of our sweaty haste, our deadless, soulless egotism, our fragile apologetic, emasculating state. The slum, like the grime, malvolent ogre of the fairy tale, was feasted with children—ground out, destroyed, and corrupted in their weakness, and thrown aside in adolescence, like a dry orange.

"To the slum eventually came the men who were maimed in factories, in mines, on railroads, and could not recover the cost of crutch and bandage. To the slum came the wives and babies of men killed outright in industry or poisoned systematically, and for profit, by advertised foods and medicines.

"The State, the natural representative of the people, fed the slums. It did not interfere when women staggered under excessive tasks; when old men were thrown out upon the pavement; when young girls, unable to support themselves decently, sold themselves outright to indecency; when strikes broke out and men were starved or shot or bayoneted, or in their turn broke the arms of strike-breakers, or set fire to their employers' buildings.

"The State had no eyes, senses, dimensions. It was nothing but a paralytic old man with a club."

The slum is in Philadelphia, as in New York and in Chicago. There is a problem of housing, of congestion, that should cause the Philadelphia churches to pause and consider, and then to get whole-heartedly in back of the agencies that are trying to better conditions. In some sections of the Christian city of Philadelphia there are as many people to the acre, as filthily housed and

as oppressively conditioned as there are in the congested sections of Bombay and Calcutta.

Germany has solved the slum problem—there are no slums in German cities. Germany, in fact, houses its people with the same care that the Kansas farmer shelters his hogs, and to-day Germany places a premium upon her working men.

It must not be assumed that we are unmindful of the slum or that we are dilatory in applying corrective and remedial measures. As a matter of fact the war on the city slum is now practically nation wide. More than 100 American cities are at work through associations, committee and public commissions in obtaining proper housing conditions for the poor. There is a National Housing Association, and aggressively the battle against the slum is being scientifically waged throughout the United States.

Unfortunately, we believe, the Church is not definitely related to these anti-slum movements. It is not to be expected that the Church shall so broaden its function as to bring it militantly as an organization into a campaign of this nature, nor that the power of the Church is to be exercised in the same manner or along the same lines as the power which is vested in a city's Board of Health, Bureau of Education or Department of Police, but if it is a religious work for the Church to exercise its enormous power to the end that the saloon shall be abolished and the liquor traffic stamped out, is it not equally a religious work for the Church to exercise the same power, in the same manner, and to the end that the slum shall be utterly annihilated?

Not until the members of the Churches begin to gain a measurable appreciation of what the slum means, and of what congestion of population means, can it be said that we have even started to set ourselves in the way of catching up with Germany in this respect.

Investigations made in New York and Philadelphia in connection with the Men and Religion Movement yielded facts that both shocked and alarmed the Christian workers of these cities. It developed that in some of the congested sections of New York there was a density of more than 1200 people to the acre; that 105 blocks in Manhattan (which is the old City of New York), had an average density of 750 to the acre; and that more than two millions of people, or nearly one-half of the population of

Greater New York, were living in tenement houses that were largely unfit for human habitation.

When these appalling facts are placed side by side with the readily demonstrable fact that Greater New York could double its population, or in other words could contain more than ten million of people and that under a proper system of distribution there need not be a greater density than that of 50 persons to the acre, it would seem that New York is just about flying in the face of Providence in permitting such unrighteous conditions to persist.

And Philadelphia, too, comes under the same indictment, for there one discovers, on investigation, 19 1-4 miles of unsewered streets in the very heart of the congested section.

If the density of the 3rd ward prevailed over the whole city, Philadelphia would have a population of over 17,000,000, and if the density of the whole city was equal to the density of the more congested areas of the 3rd ward, there would be a population in Philadelphia equal to the entire population of the New England States, several of the Southern States and with New York and Pennsylvania included.

Officially, it is announced that there are annually 9,000 preventable deaths in Philadelphia. What an appalling economic loss! Stated in the terms of business and accepting Prof. Irving Fisher's figures as to the financial value of a life, this premature plucking of human lives involves yearly the stupendous financial loss of a potential twenty millions of dollars.

And the immensity of this single problem—this problem of the herding of human souls—can be faintly realized when one understands that many of these conditions—unsocial, inhuman, unchristian—exist in marked degree in all of the large cities. Has the Church no concern here?

What of the chaining of children to the wheels of trade—the robbing of the next generation in the interest of a debased commercialism. Herod is reincarnated in some types of modern industry—types whose doctrine is the protection of infant industries and the exploitation of the infant industry. Was Stephen the first Christian martyr? Was it not a baby boy? How long shall we continue to permit this martyrdom? The challenge of the child! What says Christ's Church to this?

And the problem of the woman in industry. Does not this,

too, command the attention of the Church? Her average wage throughout the United States is reckoned at less than \$300 the year. We are fond of saying that the commercialization of social vice must be stopped but do we have in mind all the instruments which directly or indirectly commercialize vice?

Would it be possible to find on the payroll of our unregenerate industry any striking evidence to warrant the belief that the wage paid to women and girls even remotely suggests that their virtue is worthy of protection? There are agencies unconsciously employed in the vice traffic that are beyond the reach of the police. Let us not blink this fact!

What could be of more sinister portent than the statement, made by responsible men, that "Wages and the conditions of labor to-day both directly and indirectly make for the increase in dependency."

Not only that, but they undermine family life and pervert general morality. Marriage is postponed beyond a reasonable age, if not put off altogether. Mothers of young children are forced into industry. The cradle and kindergarten are plundered by a debased commercialism. The babe and his nursing bottle get on the payroll. And we think it to have been monstrous that heathen mothers in India should have yielded up their offspring to the mercies of the Ganges! Whereas, we give ours to the god of the machine! The one soothes the final sleep. The other mangles soul and body to a lingering, tortuous death. Just where are we advantaged over the Buddhists in this respect?

A broad survey of industrial conditions to-day—from the humanitarian, the religious point of view,—shows first, that women are needlessly and unseasonably worked and generally over-worked. This is a menace of to-day which will surely spell disaster for to-morrow. Second, children are prematurely and improperly worked; and if this condition alone will not make for a generation of the physically and mentally inefficient, then surely no other condition will do so. And in this respect there seems to be a recrudescence of conditions that were deemed intolerable, and were stamped out a century ago by a civilization which we believe to have been inferior to our own.

Finally, men are out of work.

In these facts is summed up the greatest problem which this day is called upon to solve—children prematurely worked, women

overworked, and men, the natural workers, the natural providers of women and children, out of work. It is this condition which produces unrest, Socialism, Anarchy. And with these facts before us shall we not studiously, earnestly, intelligently, prayerfully and purposefully, seek to apply the single solvent, the one corrective—the gospel of the Living Christ?

We have been adapting it too long. The day of application is at hand. Unconsciously, from force of habit—or from our thralldom to tradition—we have been circumscribing God's program; limiting it to the remedial, the palliative, the alleviative,—to a single phase of life. If the Gospel is great enough to remedy, surely it is powerful enough to prevent, to conserve, to preserve. Right here is the place of modern emphasis—on prevention; on conservation.

Shall the Church, the custodian of the Gospel, be of the van or the army? Shall there be a more marked alignment of opposing forces that are working for righteousness? Shall it be much longer said that we are on the verge of a world-conflict between Religion, as the people would have it expressed, on the one side, and the Church on the other? And there are distinguished Christian men who say boldly, unqualifiedly that such a conflict threatens us even at this time.

There is a new evangelism, that would bring a new revival, that would voice a modern message, based on the very Rock of Ages itself. This evangelism to-day knocks insistently upon the door of the Church. It is the evangelism that would seek the redemption of Society, and its task, which must be the task of the Church, aided by the Family and by the State, is, first, the reconciliation of the races; second, the pacification of industry; third, the moralization of business; fourth, the extermination of social vice; fifth, the purification of politics; sixth, the simplification of life.⁶ And this task must be met adequately, else the kingdom of God must ever remain in the region of dreams and of visions, and must continue to be a high-sounding but incomprehensible term of the rhetorician and sophist.

There is a prophecy that has been in sacred writ for close to two thousand years, and there is a commission which Jesus Christ gave to us, as the spiritual successors of the seventy mis-

⁶ *The Church and Modern Life*, Gladden.

sionaries whom He, Himself, instructed and commissioned, and we declare unto you that the only solvent of the social and industrial problems of to-day, the only solvent of the war between capital and labor, is that which would realize the prophecy and effectualize the commission.

"And the kingdom of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ." That is the prophecy. What kingdoms? Those of Africa and China and India; of the South Sea Islands and the Tropics; of the Russian Empire and the Arctic? Yes, all of those, but it may be noted that the Christianity which fails in a Christian land is not going to make its fullness of appeal to a heathen one, especially as the heathen to-day reads American newspapers and comes into first hand touch with Christianity's awful handicap in our cities. But the kingdoms of capital and labor, of trade and finance, of politics and government, of courts and legislatures, of family, church and state,—these kingdoms must become Christ's.

And the commission: To preach the good news, which is to evangelize; to heal the sick, which is to minister to the body; and to cast out demons, which is to rectify social maladjustments, to sweeten life, to transform environment, to Christianize society—to impress Christ upon the associated life of men.

Philadelphia, Pa.

ARTICLE II.

THE CHARACTER OF PREACHING.

BY THE REV. J. M. REIMENSNYDER, D.D.

The preaching of the Gospel is the great work of the minister, and its character at once becomes a most important question. It cannot be answered with a passing word. There are great and deep principles and facts to be taken into consideration. Paul conveyed a great historic fact to the Corinthians, when he wrote, "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." The Revised Version makes an important change in translating, Through its wisdom, instead of by wisdom.

The worldly-wise method of philosophy failed in presenting the truth successfully to the world. This was so for several thousand years. By this method a right conception of the true God was never reached by the greatest thinkers and teachers, and hence they could not communicate it to the world. The wise and learned Greeks erected an altar "To an Unknown God." Then God by the simple method of proclaiming the Gospel undertook the enlightenment of the world. This method seemed to the learned absurd. It still seems too simple to many, and yet history proves it to be the most successful. With all the criticism and specific methods suggested and practiced by so-called evangelists of a more modern type, and by some preachers, experience and good judgment show conclusively that the regular method of preaching the Gospel, pure and simple, by the ordained ministers is accomplishing the most lasting results. The truths of salvation are thus better comprehended and attended by better fruits. As the world is to be converted by preaching its greatest task and most important duty, it is self-evident that its best method should be sought and practiced.

I. THE OBJECT OF PREACHING.

The great purpose of the preaching of the Gospel is to acquaint men and women with its truths and the necessity of

giving heed to them. Religion and worship are the two most important duties of men and women. People are careless on the subject of religion and must be aroused to its consideration. The object of religion and of preaching is to bring men into a proper relation and service to their God. To lead the world of men and women to give conscientious thought and study to Eternity and to moral obligations. In all the ages of the world the questions here mentioned have obtained in the highest circles of education; and they still hold that same exalted place. Preaching has to do with all of these.

II. THE SUBJECT OF PREACHING.

The subject matter of preaching, is unquestionably the whole Word of God. This man is to preach, proclaim, and declare to man. The Word of God is the revealed truth of the Bible, which is the inspired Word of God. It must, however, be remembered that in this divine revelation, which God has given to men in the Book, which we call the Bible, we have almost every subject which can be contemplated.

We have the individual, the family, the rise and fall of kingdoms and empires, the development of a Godly line in the midst of wicked, and sinful warlike nations. We have the mingling of truth with error, the true with false gods and profane and sacred altars. We have history, science, truth, error, kings, prophets, personalities, human characteristics, principles, nations. the workings of divine providence through and amongst all of these. So that the subject matter of the Bible is as varied as human thought. We have idolatry, witch-craft and all that hinders religion and that which fosters it. And only by comparison and study of both do we rightly comprehend either, the inner and the outer life and their relation to each other. God, says, "I have set before you the way of life and death," hence both must be considered. This gives a wide and varied character to preaching, by Divine authority, and introduces all phases of thought.

III. THE PREACHING THE WORLD NEEDS—AND WHAT IT LIKES.

The human taste is a strange guide. No preacher could follow that and do his duty to his God. Paul writes to Timothy of

some kinds of preaching or teaching of which we are having an exhibition in our times, "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears." This applies with great force to common evangelistic work and to some preachers who seek after popularity. But, Paul adds at this point to the youthful minister, "I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine." It must be remembered that the preacher is called of God and of the Church for a specific duty and is charged of Him what to preach; and to God is he accountable, and, we might add, in a secondary sense also to the Church. What he preaches therefore is not a matter of likes or dislikes, but of a most solemn duty, for which he must render an account at the great day of Christ's coming. The world needs both instruction and rebuke. It needs the truth of God; and at times nothing is more severe than the truth. The world is not in accord with God or divine truth. Preaching cannot, dare not, be governed by the tastes of the world. It must be on a vastly higher plane than that. No man should know so well what to preach and how to preach as the preacher himself. He dwells among his people in all the relations of life as no other man does, not even excepting the family physician; and he lives in the Word of God. He studies both from a specific stand-point, and sees as no other man sees what the world and the Church need.

Religion is not a matter of taste, it is a question of truth and duty. God does not ask a man what he likes, but commands him what to do. The preacher, who yields to the taste of the world, fails utterly in comprehending and discharging his most sacred obligations. The preaching of the Word is not designed to please men. The Church is not a place of entertainment. It is not a place for religious or moral pastime or flattery. It is a place where religious instruction is to be dispensed, life and duty held up, sins pointed out, and the dangerous tendencies, together with numerous pit-falls of society and the world marked; to direct, warn and rebuke, as well as to comfort and to lead into safe and pleasant paths. Mercy, truth and duty all belong to this service. Society, the world, the city and the

nation all run at times against the truth and the Church. They darken the path of uprightness, truth, morals and duty, and all of these must be discussed.

Man likes many things he should not; and dislikes many things which he should countenance, and duties which he should perform. Here is just one of the most important works of the preacher. The man of God, must be like the prophets; a hero, a daring, unflinching man. Meeting these things squarely, he must at times do like the prophet Nathan, say even to the king, "Thou art the man!" It is not the preaching I like, but the preaching, I need. This the faithful minister must glean from the Word and from direct communion with his God. He must also study the flock over which he has been placed as a good shepherd. If the preacher be a true man of God, living up to what he preaches and clothing his words in grace and humility, working under the Holy Spirit, he may deliver his message ever so directly and earnestly and his people will both hear and heed him kindly. Much depends upon the motive and the manner and the grace accompanying what is said and done. The minister must know his audience to be effective.

In our day evil is bold and defiant, pleasure thoughtless, sinful and world-loving, and these conditions must be met with a strong, and vigorous pulpit, which fears not public sentiment nor anything which opposes duty. In all of this the preacher must be backed by the Word. That and that alone is the secret of success. Nor will this make the preacher unpopular even with the world. He will be all the stronger and the more highly respected. Even the world despises a man who does not truly represent his profession, and honors the man who stands by his guns, though the shots pierce to the quick, for the world has a soul and a conscience.

It is a mistaken conception of the needs of the hour, that the preaching is all to be simple. The manner or method may be simple, but not the thought. The language of Jesus was simple so that any one can understand it, but the thoughts of his discourses and parables were profound, and far-reaching. We live in a wonderful age of learning, thought and intelligence. Everybody reads, and the preaching must be on a higher plane. Most ministers who fail to-day, fail because they do not study enough, because they are not in thought abreast with the age and with

their hearers. The fundamentals of that divine faith once committed to the saints are assailed in these days at every point: The Personality of God; the Deity of Christ; the Inspiration of the Scriptures; the efficacy of the Atonement; the vital character of a true religious and spiritual life; the very necessity of Church membership. All of these fundamental doctrines must be studied and presented from the pulpit in a scholarly manner, at proper intervals. If the pulpit does not defend the faith, who or what will?

The great discoveries of modern times, the excavations in Bible lands, certain phases of science and archaeology, are falsely arrayed against the chronology and records of the Bible. Our best citizens and Church members and students in our Public Schools and Colleges come into contact with these ideas in text books, in histories, in current and popular literature, magazines and the secular press. Minds become filled with these things. The writer has often found it so. The very life of the Church and of religion makes it necessary for the minister to study these misapprehensions that he may intelligently correct them. The writer has been led, by finding these sentiments broad-cast, to twenty years of specific study along these lines and gives the fruit of it to his people, discriminately. He has preached and lectured on these subjects in more than twenty of our largest cities and has found everywhere a remarkable interest. These subjects are almost universally treated in a way that lessens respect for the reliability of the Bible. No matter what some may say or think, the writer knows from personal contact, that these are the vital questions in these days when the public press is full of "Higher Criticism" in a most unguarded way. There must be the voice of the learned prophet against it. There must be a test of Gods, as when Elijah met the prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel almost three thousand years ago. The preacher must know how to do these things, without wearying his hearers or forgetting their application to Christian faith and life. He is to treat them as defending the faith, and in keeping with the fact that he is in the pulpit, where he is to preach the Word.

Another point is not to be forgotten: the different classes in the congregation. The great difference in their opportunities for information, capability to understand and comprehend, their education or their lack of it must be taken into account. Those

whose advantages have been least may need the sermons most. All classes must have their meat in due season. Many have no idea of the Bible as a whole, of the great historical veins running through it, of the unity and continuity. And no one can possibly have the strongest grasp upon the truth and God's Divine plan of Salvation, who does not thus understand Revelation. Something should be known of the lands of the Bible, of ancient peoples, of the times in which the Bible was written and of the writers. These subjects can occasionally be introduced in such a way as to be very instructive and helpful, without lessening in any degree the spiritual lessons. Maps and charts can be used in the pulpit along with sermons to the greatest possible advantage. This is what we practice and call up-to-date preaching. On special occasions Church and Bible history can be used.

Preaching must always be based first and specifically upon God's Word. Then it should be in harmony with the accepted Creeds of the Church as the authorized historic interpretation and the proper expression of that inspired Word. Then preaching must also bear an appropriate relation to the age in which it is done, its trend and thought, also to the community or locality and to the congregation or audience, its character and capability, yet in no sense compromising the truth, but in a practical way adapting it to the specific needs. Ages and Centuries differ greatly. History is written in Centuries. We must consider intelligence, social standards and conditions, education, specific tendencies, characteristics, and weaknesses. The Word naturally meets all of these conditions, without being itself changed in any sense.

IV. MANUSCRIPT AND THE TIME LIMIT.

Here are two practical phases for our subject, which are largely modern. On these subjects, there is much said with little knowledge or fairness. The writer approaches this part of our subject, without any personal bias, as he uses different methods and limits. There is much prejudice and unwarranted criticism of the pulpit in regard to the use of manuscript and the length of sermons. Surely the preaching of the Word is as important as any other possible address and discussion, and no one thinks of applying this rule so closely to other public speakers.

A written address usually contains more thought and has the specific advantage of choice language, continuity of thought, and connected and logical statements, which appeal to the intelligent hearer. Unless one can be an expert in public address, there is no exception to this rule. A memorized sermon is particularly objectionable, and always loses force or aggressiveness. You can almost see or feel the speaker looking backward, rather than forward to the truth.

As to the manuscript everything depends upon how it is used. The great majority of speakers use some manuscript at least as a guide; and manuscript is almost universal to all speakers on great occasions. The delivery of a sermon is always a great occasion to the true minister. The writer, from his earliest College days, has made public speaking his joy and life-work. He seldom reads and has preached and delivered many brief and impromptu addresses and preaches frequently entirely without notes, so he thinks he can speak advisedly and fairly.

Most of the so-called off-hand sermons and addresses are open to much criticism. Having served a long course as critic, we can look into these things with a disciplined mind. The writer has heard few sermons and addresses fifteen minutes long and off-hand that were worth listening to, or contained much that was worth remembering. Important themes are not so easily solved. A written discourse at least gives evidence of application to the theme. We can conceive of no reason why the sermon should be so limited, when no other public address is so prescribed. Men and women will listen for two hours, without criticism to a lecture, most of which you have read or known before. They will attend the theatre or moving picture exhibitions and see or hear nothing elevating and pay for admission, and then come home and go to Church and demand that the man of God, who comes only weekly to his audience with the greatest theme and principles of which we can conceive, be limited to fifteen or twenty minutes, when the entire service is not much over an hour and not always that. Who ever heard of a lawyer pleading an important case before a jury with such a limit? The few exceptions are no argument. They often take hours and even days in which to make their plea.

The great addresses of history, which have made lasting impressions upon the world have not been fifteen or twenty minute

addresses. The Reformers and Church Fathers were not brief preachers in their memorable discourses. The editorials of the great Dailies on political questions, and the decisions of the Courts on important cases are not confined to a few words. Peter's sermon on Pentecost, and Christ's Sermon on the Mount, we do not believe, were brief. We must remember that we have only reports of these. Paul's discourse at Troas was continued until midnight. Of course, there was one youth there who failed to keep his interest, Eutychus, who was seated in the window, and being overcome by a deep sleep, fell down from the third loft. But as the great Apostle restored him, his case should not be quoted as a criticism of a long sermon.

One of the greatest sermons, which we have ever heard, was delivered, in June to fifteen hundred people crowded together, by a great London divine in the city of Harrisburg, and was two hours long and we remember it yet and would listen to it again. When the man of God comes only weekly before the public with a divinely suggested truth or theme, while the great issues of history have been moving across the canvass of life for six days, he should not be arbitrarily limited in time, especially to fifteen minutes.

Personally we do not practice or believe in long discourses except on rare occasions. But it is exceedingly difficult to limit a proper discourse, and especially when not written, to a brief period of time. It is well enough to have thirty minutes in mind, as a basis.

V. SCRIPTURAL INJUNCTIONS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

Matt. 4:17—"From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Matt. 10:7—"And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Mark, 1:4—"John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach, the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." He had a message for the Pharisees and Sadducees, for publicans and soldiers, yea, for all classes of people. Peter on Pentecost, Acts, 2:38-40—"Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost.... And with many other words did he testify and exhort saying: Save

yourselves from this untoward generation." Luke 9:60—"Go thou and preach the kingdom of God." Acts 5:42—"And daily in the Temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ." Acts 10:42—"And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead." Acts 14:15—"And preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein." Acts 17:3—"And that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ." Luke, 8:1—(Jesus), "He went throughout every city and village, preaching and shewing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God." Luke, 8:4—"And when much people were gathered together, and were come to him out of every city, he spake by a parable." Second Timothy, 4:2—"Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine." Col. 1:28—"Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." Second Cor., 4:5—"For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus sake." First Cor., 1:23—"But we preach Christ crucified." Romans, 10:8—"That is the word of faith, which we preach." Second Timothy, 3:16—"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Hebrews, 4:12—"For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart." (13)—"Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." (14)—"Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession." Second Timothy, 2:15—"Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."

VI—FINALLY.

We believe that anyone who has made the preaching of the Word his great life-work and given it his best thought, will agree with the writer in the following statements:

First, That the preaching of the Gospel to be effective in this educated and critical age demands the most profound scholarship as well as general knowledge.

Second, That it requires a most thorough and critical knowledge of every-day affairs—of the great world-movements, of social conditions, of the trend of thought and life, for religion is to be man's best companion in all of these.

Third, That to be effective in building up character, regulating society and elevating moral standards, requires an adroitness, aptness and skill to teach and guide such as no other age in all history has required. Where the Church fails, it fails largely because of its lack in properly meeting these issues with the Word of God, and the testimonies of history, which teems with examples for our admonition.

Real up-to-date preaching compromises nothing, stands firmly on the Old Book and on the old historic Creedal foundations, and presents the same eternal fundamental truths in a new dress and combinations, applying them to new conditions, without lowering the dignity of truth, as is often done in using modern evangelistic ideas or sentimental or sensational themes. The preaching of the Gospel in its truth and simplicity systematically builds up character and spiritual life, thus making better citizens and Christians or Church members.

Religious thought more than any other has claimed the attention of the human race in all history, and it still leads. Around it have centered the greatest struggles and conquests. False philosophy and false religions, mere human creations, have ever stood against the only, one, true God. The forms, creeds and practices of true religion have ever been assailed. The same is true to-day, under new forms and terminology. The old schools of philosophy are still against the Church. If the Church does not meet these, as Christ met them, she will fail.

The relation of the true God to false standards, and the superior claims of Revelation and Christianity and Christian duty must be clearly set forth to each generation, proving and urging

the truth as was done in the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. The minister preaches to a reading and thinking audience, as in no past age. The age is not reading the Bible as it reads other literature. We are not speaking now of the wonderful advance of Bible study by the Church and its schools, but even that fact emphasizes our position. The inquiring mind is full of research and its personality leads public sentiment which must be won and held to the truth. And the pulpit must stand in the van in thought. Hence, as never before in the history of Christendom, must the minister be a student. And he should give his best thoughts to his congregation, that they may shine as lights in the world of thought. If the ministry is weak or fails in our day, it is because it does not lead in thought as in past ages. The pulpit to retain its prestige must stand at least on a par with the best thinkers and writers in all departments of learning.

We have been practicing these principles for twenty years, and have stood for twenty-five years as pastor of one Church where we invite our readers to come and see. In this time some other Churches have changed pastors seventy-one times.

Milton, Pa.

ARTICLE III.

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD.

BY THE REV. J. S. SIMON, D.D.

Paul is sometimes called, by way of emphasis and not by way of exclusion, the apostle of faith, or more strictly, of the righteousness of faith. His whole ministry was given to the work of persuading men of the all-sufficiency of God's righteousness and the insufficiency of their own righteousness to justify them before God. Of his own people he said, "They being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." Writing to the Philippians he, though he could boast of having been a pharisee of the pharisees, repudiates his own righteousness and lays claim to the righteousness of God; "Not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." Paul's epistles are particularly full and copious as a testimony to a righteousness which is not brought in by the law, but by grace; which is counted not to works but to faith. In a great variety of ways, and with much skill, he establishes the doctrine of the atonement, which enshrines the righteousness of God, imputed to man under certain conditions. In it he sees the objective truth of the law and the prophets, and the substance of the Old Testament types and shadows, all verified by his deep experimental acquaintance with Jesus Christ as the end of the law.

The religious life of our day needs a re-emphasis of what Paul saw in the person and work of Christ; "For God hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." As Luther, by the power of God, brought to the attention of the world of his day what was equivalent to a new revelation of the old revelation of Paul, justification by faith alone, and by it overcame Rome's work righteousness, so must the true Church of our day overcome the work righteousness of both a negative Protestantism and of a positive Romanism by a re-emphasis of the righteousness of faith. Surely it

cannot be counted a useless task to restate the teaching of Paul on the subject of justification when one reads, in a book written to set forth the views of sin which the modern scientific mind is willing to hold, such a declaration as this; "To answer that the moral law has been satisfied because some one else has borne the penalty, that Christ has suffered, and therefore the sinner need not suffer, is an idea that can never be accepted by a being who is morally sane." In the same book we read the following very delightfully indefinite expression of optimism; "Somehow and somewhere man must come to himself, however long-deferred the awakening, and however painful the process by which it may be accomplished, and when he comes to himself he will come to God." Judas came to himself, but he did not come to God. The same author, speaking with a tone of authority, says, "It was essential to the true attainment of man's destiny that he should realize himself through struggle, and that there should be open to him certain experiments, which, being doomed to failure and dissatisfaction, should leave finally and permanently open only the true path of union with God." Surely the writer of such words has, with the Scriptural view of sin also gotten rid of the Protestant conception of the normative character of Holy Scripture. Such a process of coming to God is about as full of encouragement for a soul enslaved by sin as would be the oriental process of transmigration.

A clear apprehension of the plan of salvation, so positively set forth by Paul, is the best guard and protection against all such scientific heathenism that can be given to the humanity of our day. A deep and true appreciation of what Paul means by the righteousness of God and of the supreme place he gives it in his statement of God's plan of redemption of our sinful humanity will leave no room in the mind and heart of the faithful student of Holy Scripture for the pharisaic systems of our generation which minimize, or altogether deny, the fact and the guilt of sin.

It seems to me there is also great need for a re-emphasis of the great doctrine of faith, as set forth by Paul, in our time because of the tremendous emphasis now being laid upon the social service side of the life of the Church. The Church is in grave danger of overlooking entirely, as apparently large sections of it have already done, the only thing that can bring in a true social service, the redeeming love of God; "God so loved the world."

This love is not merely a general love but a particular love; it is not only creative and providential but also soteriological, "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us." This redeeming love of God alone can bring in a true social service, "If God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." Christianity is the only really social and humanitarian religion. Men are really blessed only as they are truly free, "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. The truth that shall make men really free is Jesus Christ, "If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." The truth that makes men free is not scientific truth, nor is it economic truth, much less theory, a certain number of dollars does not guarantee a certain degree of virtue, but it is that truth set forth in Jesus Christ, who says, "I am the truth."

To the pharisaic cast of thought, so prevalent in much of modern preaching, Paul makes complete answer in his epistles. The truth, whose opposite is a mere work righteousness, is found in his descriptive term, *The Righteousness of God*. These words, as used by Paul, are expressive of the completed work of Jesus Christ as our Redeemer, a work approved at the tribunal of God, as witnessed by the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and now offered to the sinner as the meritorious ground of his justification.

This question is not without some interest and much value, In what, according to Paul, does the Righteousness of God by Faith consist?

Negatively, it is not, as the phrase might seem to imply, the essential righteousness of God, nor is it Christ's essential righteousness as a person. The divine attribute of righteousness is not communicable and it cannot, therefore, be imputed. The inherent righteousness of Jesus cannot be given to any other for it is a necessity to the perfection of His own nature. If the essential righteousness of Jesus could be imputed to sinners for their justification, His death would be a meaningless tragedy. The phrase, which forms the subject for this article, uniformly refers to that which is due from man, and which God must demand from him, or else wink at the violation of His own law. God does not require of man that he should produce a divine righteousness but only a human righteousness. The righteousness of God is, hence, a descriptive name for that which Adam

should have rendered to God, and did not; also for that which we should bring to Him, and do not. In the great declaration of 2 Cor. V. 21, Paul clearly shows that he does not mean the attribute of righteousness when he speaks of the righteousness of God: "For He hath made Him to be sin for us, Who knew no sin: that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." It is evident that the Apostle does not mean to say that the Christian is made the divine attribute of righteousness.

Again, negatively, it is not an in-wrought, subjective righteousness. Not a single element in it proceeds from what the sinner either is or has done. In the production of this righteousness, Jesus Christ could have claimed, "Of the people there was none with Me." It is for the sake of man but not by the help of man. This righteousness is of such a character that "to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Evidently the justification here spoken of is of the person of the ungodly and not of their nature, for God cannot justify ungodliness, or sin. It speaks of the acceptance of the person and not of the renovation of the heart. It is an objective righteousness ("they being ignorant of God's righteousness"), and not subjective ("and going about to establish their own"). Man's good works cannot add anything to its excellence, and his sin cannot dim its divine perfection and glory. It is a perfect, gracious, holy reality which is to be preached to men and offered to them as God's supply for their need; it is not an ideal to be evolved out of man and which first becomes real in his character. It is the righteousness of One which may be upon all men "unto justification of life."

This objective character of the righteousness of God stands out in bold relief in the words above quoted from 2 Cor. V. 21. These words say clearly that in the same sense in which Christ was made sin—and that can be only objectively and representatively, or by imputation—in that sense are we made the righteousness of God in Him. Paul, again and again, declares, with all possible force and clearness, that the righteousness of God is not a subjective righteousness; "Not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."

Some have thought that God counts faith for righteousness, or that merit is ascribed to belief. But Scripture never says that

God imputes righteousness on the ground of faith but only through faith. If faith is a cause of righteousness, then the gospel is only a new law, which says, "Do, and live." On this theory, God accepts an imperfect title to eternal life, on the part of the sinner, or, in other words, He accommodates His claim to the ability of man to meet it. God is thus declared to be the great compromiser of His own holy law. And, by the way, it is very difficult to see how every theory of justification which sets aside the plan of God as given in the New Testament, the bringing in of a perfect human righteousness through Jesus Christ, is not guilty of detracting from God's glorious holiness by making Him, in the interest of His love, the compromiser of the sacred law which He Himself has promulgated. The view that God counts faith itself for righteousness seems very nearly related to that other view that He forgives sin upon simple repentance, and the propitiation for sin is, hence, unnecessary. In both cases God recedes from His right, a right which the Bible views as inalienable, and takes less than what is His due. Such views would also take away any necessity for the Incarnation and atonement.

Saving faith is not meritorious but receptive only. It is a most self-emptying act of the soul. Instead of claiming merit, faith says, "Not having mine own righteousness."

Positively, The righteousness of God is an accomplished fact. It is as real as sin. There are two great facts in human history—the sin of man and the righteousness of God—and these two confront each other. God contributed nothing to man's sin and man contributed nothing to the righteousness of God, unless it be counted a contribution that man murdered the Lord of Glory. God's righteousness is the great subject matter of the gospel. To change it, or to omit it, is to bring in another gospel. It is the special work of the ministry to testify to this righteousness, and the ministration of the gospel is "the ministration of righteousness."

This righteousness was brought in at a certain time, it was manifested as a historic fact; "Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested." This evidently refers to the preparation and completion of the righteousness in the mediatorial work of Jesus Christ, whose life of humiliation was for the sake of the righteousness which, when presented before the

throne of God, would lead to a re-adjustment of man's relation to his Maker.

The standard of this righteousness is the justice of God and His holiness as expressed in the law of God. God does not call in question His own holiness, nor cast reproach on His own justice when he justifies the sinner on the ground of the merits of Jesus Christ; "To declare at this time His righteousness: that He might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Here it is declared that God does not recede from His justice one iota, He does not compromise the demands of His own law, when He justifies the sinner who believes in Jesus Christ because, as stated in the context, He has brought in a righteousness for the remission of the sins that are past. The Christian may with confidence ask the question which Abraham once asked of the Lord, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" and he may point with assurance to the redemptive work of Jesus Christ as the most convincing proof of the fact that God does right even in the justification of the sinner. In this fact lies one of the reasons why the gospel has perpetual power over the human heart. No system of religion can permanently make its way in the life of the world if it does either one of two things—minimizes sin or makes God less than infinitely just in His forgiveness of sin. The human heart knows the bitterness of sin, and will not forever be lulled into a false peace by those liars who say there is no sin, and the human conscience will not always be satisfied with a forgiveness that casts reproach upon God's holiness and seems to make His justice less than just.

To whom is this righteousness given? Only to the believer. It is the righteousness of God by faith in Jesus Christ. As already noticed, and as Scripture declares, the righteousness is in another person, so that it can be imparted and received only as a gift, and this gift is given only to faith. Faith sees in the righteousness of God, brought in by the active and passive obedience of Jesus Christ, all that man should have rendered to God, and when, by the Word of God, He is offered to it as righteousness, gladly receives Him.

The result of the acceptance by faith of the righteousness of God is the justification of our persons. The sentence is complete at once and nothing can be added to it. Divine justice must set the sinner free when he comes before it with the per-

fect righteousness of Jesus Christ, for there is no flaw in it upon which it can pronounce sentence, or through which it can bring the sinner into a new condemnation. No wonder Paul, the Apostle of the righteousness of faith, cried out with great exultation, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that has died, yea, rather, that is risen again, Who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."

What a glorious gospel the gospel of the righteousness of God is. How suited to the fundamental need of humanity. How it harmonizes the love of God and His justice in the redemption of the sinner.

This gospel of Paul makes bold preachers, who know that they have a message of infinite importance for sinners, and that means for all men. They know that what they preach has to do with the great problem of eternal life or eternal death, and holy necessity is laid upon them, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel." The preacher has no special call to discuss and agitate questions which concern material things, which are of the kingdoms of this world. He always makes a sad mistake when he departs from the divinely announced program, "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

The gospel according to Paul, in which the righteousness of God is the central thought, will draw men to Christ, for it contains what they really need, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me." It will not entertain the ungodly, but entertainment is not a divinely constituted element of the conquering power of the gospel; "We preach Christ crucified unto the Jews a stumbling-block and unto the Greeks foolishness, but unto us who are called, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."

In the interest of a so-called new theology, the cry has gone out, "Back from Paul to Christ." In the interest of a true theology and of a true Christianity the cry ought to be, "Back from the evolutionary negations of our day, back from its pharisaic, bloodless religions, to the Christ of Paul 'Who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption.'"

Hagerstown, Md.

ARTICLE IV.

GERMAN-AMERICAN LITERATURE.

BY LUCY FORNEY BITTENDER.

In the numerous histories of American literature which have appeared there is one aspect which has not been considered or even mentioned. American literature is usually defined as English literature produced in America by people of English descent and its continuity with the literature of Britain is much insisted upon. Yet there is another small but interesting section of writing which did not have its roots, either racially or geographically, in the British Isles: that is the literature which has been produced in America by Germans—German-American literature. In the earlier or colonial period this was exclusively in the German tongue; later it became English in language and lost its markedly Teutonic stamp just as the Anglo-Saxon writers graduated from the Puritan and Addisonian schools of thought into something still in process of formation but distinctively national. There is also a small section of German-American literature which consists of writing by German authors temporarily resident in the United States, sometimes American in subject-matter, sometimes not, but belonging in reality to the literature of the Fatherland and not to that of the "neuen Heimath": examples of this are the American poems of Lenau, the historical work of Kapp and the writings of the author who called himself "Charles Sealsfield."

As, in the English literature written in America, one must look to the England from which the writers came to understand it, so in this, the student must remember the conditions—both literary and political—in Germany, to understand both the form and the content of this German-American writing. Our German immigrants in Colonial or Revolutionary times came almost exclusively from the Rhineland. There the one glorious fact in German history of the eighteenth century—the rise of Prussia under Frederick the Great—was unimportant. The preponderant influence, the great fact in Rhenish life was the power of France in language, in literature, in fashion, in her political

moves. It was Louis XIV's revocation of the Edict of Nantes which deluged the Rhine countries with one hundred thousand fleeing Huguenots and left an impress upon the population which is still visible; it was France which took Strasburg, which devastated the Palatinate which supplied the model court and government upon which every little princeling built his Versailles, constructed a brilliant court, taxed and oppressed his subjects. In literature Gottsched, the great Swiss critic, advised his countrymen, if they would shine, to imitate the French classic writers; and the contests between him, and his fellow-countrymen Bodmer and Breitinger—who upheld the superiority of the English writers, Thompson, Pope and most of all Milton—had little influence upon the taste of the higher classes until Klopstock's "Messiah," a frank imitation of *Paradise Lost*, took the nation by storm and Wieland finally weaned the educated from their blind admiration of everything French. The great awakening of German thought under Goethe and Schiller did not take place until the end of the eighteenth century and the emigrants from the Fatherland were unaffected by it; their models in literary matters were the Swiss writers: Gellert in his fables and hymns; Klopstock, that "very German Milton"; Lessing instructing the nation in *Laocoon* and awakening it by his contemporary subject in *Minna von Barnhelm*; Herder, whose greatest service to German literature was that he was the preceptor of Goethe.

But in reality, these feeble beginnings of the great revival of Teutonic learning were as nothing in their influence compared with religious and theological ideas. What little life was left in Germany after the immense catastrophe of the Thirty Year's War took a religious form. Often indeed it showed itself in unspeakably wearisome theological controversy; but in the Rhineland especially, the racial turn for mysticism united with the indigenous revival of practical religion under the form and name of Pietism to make a people who lived the conviction that "Religion is the chief concern of mortals here below." Much and varied persecution strengthened the Rhinelanders in this belief. The Huguenots and Waldenses had fled or been exiled to that region in large numbers; the native Calvinists or Lutherans had borne much for their respective beliefs; the sects—such as the Mennonites, Dunkers, and a score of others were often fiercely persecuted; while innumerable little knots of believers sought

the salvation of their souls in strange ways, under the guidance of some fervent clergyman or inspired layman. The mental pabulum of such seeking souls was exclusively religious. What cared they for dramatic unity, the respective excellences of French classicists or English naturalists, the characteristics of an epic? They read that great thesaurus of the churchly mystic Arndt: his "Six Books concerning True Christianity" with its extracts from Tauler and Thomas 'a Kempis, the Blessed Angela of Foligno's "Theology of the Cross" and the heretic Weigel's "Little Tract on Prayer." They pored over Petersen's "chiliast dreams," the Rosicrucian fantasy of Andreae, the revelations of Rosamunde von Asseburg. The French literature which they affected was that written by Antoinette Bourignon and Jean de Labadie; the English writer whom they admired was the "non-juror" Law or the "Philadelphian" Jane Leade. Or if they were "churchly" Pietists, they read and sung and learnt by heart the glorious hymns of Luther, Angelus Silesius, Simon Dach, Gerhard—all men of like passions with themselves "hard pressed in the difficult ways of this world" yet of invincible faith and courage. The Mennonites kept up their hearts by reading the great "Martyr-Book," as it is colloquially called—"The Bloody Theatre of the Witnesses for Jesus Christ"—1000 pages, illustrated by a fearful picture of believers undergoing every imaginable torture and containing accounts, century by century, of all the "faithful witnesses" from the Neronian and Diocletian persecutions until the time of the writer, when the "defenceless Christians" (as the Mennonites usually called themselves) were undergoing terrible sufferings in every country from Switzerland to England for the inadequate cause of a belief in adult baptism. This was what the people read; what their educated men, clergymen and laymen, read and wrote and there were far more such men, graduates of the great pietist foundations of Halle and Giessen, than the English public ever knew. The literary, the scientific, the governmental movements of 18th century Germany passed unheeded over their heads; their chief—indeed their only—desire was, as Pastorius said of himself: "to lead a quiet and Christian life."

The earliest efforts of German-Americans in the literary field are, like those of the English colonists: descriptions of the new land, religious or theological writings usually with a strong polemical cast. They compare favorably with the earliest efforts

of the English when looked at man for man and book for book. Thus Pastorius' "Beschreibung" is better German than Smith's "Relation" is English; more nearly comparable to Winthrop's account of the beginnings of Plymouth. Pastorius was of course very different from the soldier of fortune whose vigorous and unpremeditated stories of early experiences in Virginia have come down to us; the founder of Germantown was a university man, accustomed to cultivated society, of a lovely and devout spirit, with those little pedantries of a scholar which are rather piquant than displeasing when they show themselves in the Pennsylvania forests. His poetry is often no more than doggerel, which judgment must be passed as well upon the effusions of the Tenth Muse, Mistress Anne Bradstreet. But his garden which he tended with the fervor of the flower-loving South German, inspired him to strains as graceful as this:

VERGISS MEIN NICHT.

Ob ich Deiner schon vergiss
 Und des rechten Wegs oft miss,
 Auch versäume meine Pflicht,
 Lieber Gott, vergiss mein nicht.
 Bring mich wieder auf die Bahn,
 Nimm mich zu Genaden an;
 Und, wenn mich der Feind anficht,
 Lieber Gott, vergiss mein nicht.
 Doch ich weiss, Dein Vaterherz
 Neigt in Lieb' sich niederwärts,
 Ist in Treu' auf mich gericht,
 Und vergisst mein nimmer nicht.

The Latin invocation with which Pastorius began the town-records of Germantown is known to us through Whittier's rhythmic translation and may have suffered a "change into something rich and strange" in the Quaker poet's imagination, but the substance remains touching as well as beautiful:

"Hail to posterity!

Hail, future men of Germanopolis!

Let the young generations yet to be

Look kindly upon this.

Think how your fathers left their native land,—

Dear German-land! O sacred hearths and homes!—

And where the wild beast roams,

In patience planned
New forest homes beyond the mighty sea,
There undisturbed and free
To live as brothers of one family.
What pains and cares befell,
What trials and what fears,
Remember, and wherein we have done well
Follow our footsteps, men of coming years!
Where we have failed to do
Aright, or wisely live,
Be warned by us, the better way pursue,
And, knowing we were human, even as you,
Pity us and forgive!
Farewell, Posterity!
Farewell, dear Germany!
Forevermore farewell!"

The famous protest against slavery is not written in his native tongue but in English, yet it is clear and moving, though destitute of literary art:

"How fearful and fainthearted are many at sea when they see a strange vessel being afraid it should be a Turk and they should be taken and sold for slaves in Turkey. Now what is this better done than Turks do? yea, rather is it worse for them which say they are Christians. . . . Now though they be black, we cannot conceive there is more liberty to have them slaves as it is to have other white men. . . . Pray, what thing in the world can be done worse toward us than if men should rob or steal us away and sell us for slaves to strange countries, separating husbands from their wives and children. Being now this is not done at that manner we will be done at, therefor we contradict and are against this traffic of men-body."

When Germantown had been settled a score of years there came over a little community of Rosicrucian mystics, called the "Woman in the Wilderness" which furnished an undue proportion of the learned and the literary to the town. The community leader, Kelpius, died young leaving many religious letters and some devotional poetry, hardly worth quoting, as his contribution to the common weal. A member of the society, Falkner, soon left the hermits and was ordained into the Lutheran ministry; he was a devout, hard-working, useful man, in labors

abundant among the Germans scattered abroad like sheep without a shepherd, in New Jersey and along the Hudson from New York City to Albany. He found time to write several hymns still in use, the best being "Auf ihr Christen, Christi Glieder," the English version being "Rise, ye children of salvation." Another member of the community, Köster, wrote the first Latin book composed in Pennsylvania which he was obliged to have printed in Europe as no one here could read the proof.

The next manifestation of literary activity concerns a settlement far to the South: that of the Salzburgers at Ebenezer, near Savannah. These colonists were a remnant of the Lutherans exiled from their native Alps by the zeal of a new Catholic archbishop. These thirty-thousand emigrants for conscience sake naturally excited much sympathy and commiseration as they marched, singing hymns, through Protestant Germany; and in Augsburg Pastor Urlsperger was so moved that he interested himself to collect money for the transportation of a few to Oglethorpe's new colony of Georgia. They were sent thither under the care of Baron von Reck and the journal of this devout and upright young nobleman, with the periodical accounts of how the Salzburg colony prospered—the latter published under the title of the "Urlsperger Nachrichten"—furnish us with some interesting history and description of the Southern colonies in 1734 and later. But it must be admitted that the Urlsperger accounts are so exclusively written for the use of edifying that one learns little except the religious experiences of the colonists. Baron Reck's journal contains the observations of a cultivated man who travelled over a wide extent of country and is of correspondingly greater literary value.

About the time that the persecuted Salzburgers were settling themselves in Georgia and raising their Ebenezer, there appeared in Pennsylvania the first book on pedagogy written in America: the Mennonite Christopher Dock's description of his method of teaching school. Dock was well-known in his own neighborhood (Montgomery County, Penna.) for his kindly and reasonable school discipline and was finally persuaded to describe in a little book his rules. He seems to have been an independent anticipator of Pestalozzi and Froebel in his kindly methods, his endeavor to make learning attractive and easy to the pupils, and much besides; in that age of severity and punishment he had the

courage to write: "Those who will be instructed and guided by the eye have no need of bit and bridle. This difference can be seen in unreasoning beasts. One wagoner does use one-half as hard shouts, scourges and blows as another and yet drives as hard or even harder over mountain and valley and when the work is done the willing horses and the wagoner have had it the easier. The horses have felt less blows and it has not been necessary for the wagoner to drive by punishment. They have done willingly what others must have done by severity."

Dock's book was published by the Franklin of the Pennsylvania Germans, the elder Christopher Saur; his life and career are connected with almost all the movements of importance among them. Saur emigrated with his wife and little son, settling in Lancaster county as soon as that frontier region was open to the white man; but he was preceded thither by a religious fanatic, Conrad Beissel by name, who entertained all sorts of queer speculations: some derived from Boehme, some from the Dunkers who were just arising as a sect and had, most of them, come to Pennsylvania. Beissel however soon became too advanced in holiness, as he himself thought, to consort with the simple-minded Baptist Brethren; he wrote several tracts upon the necessity of observing the Jewish Sabbath and the sinfulness of matrimony, then presently retired to a log hut with some like-minded friends to live a hermit's life. Adherents, both men and women, flocked about him so that he was compelled to leave the hermitage and found a number of monastic houses for them. Among his novices was Saur's wife who became Sister Marcella in the convent at Ephrata, as Beissel called his community. It was not only simple house-wives such as this that Beissel took captive; a man sturdy and sensible as Conrad Weiser, "The Interpreter," had his brief period of Kloster life. Weiser's father had been a head man among the unfortunate colonists of Schoharie, sent over here by the bounty of Queen Anne when they fled from their desolate Palatinate homes to London. In the New York forests they felt themselves deserted and ill-treated, so they made their way along Indian trails to the head waters of the Susquehanna and on rude rafts floated down its streams to Pennsylvania. They were always in friendly relations with the neighboring Indians and young Conrad had spent a winter in an Indian camp, learning their language so perfectly that he was,

after his liberation from Beissel's influence, for years the official interpreter of the province of Pennsylvania.

Saur with his little un-mothered boy returned to Germantown where in a short time he decided to start a printing office, having in some unexplained way come into possession of a press and fonts of German type; previous to this Benjamin Franklin had done the printing for the Germans, but in the Latin type. Saur's first imprint in 1738 was an almanac, the forerunner of those which still delight and edify the Pennsylvania Germans.

His next effort was the printing of the *Weihrauchs-Hügel*, (Hill of Incense), the fantastically-named hymn-book of the Ephrata cloister. This was (with the possible exception of Sewell's *History of the Quakers*) the largest book printed up to that time in Pennsylvania, being a thick octavo of 820 pages. Amid its mystical doggerel Saur found a stanza, which he thought might be a blasphemous allusion to Beissel; this "Father Friedsam" and his followers would neither acknowledge nor deny, and a violent controversy arose, carried on by pamphlets, in which the victory remained with Saur; but the upshot of the matter was that the monks of Ephrata set up a press of their own. The Germantown printer was by this time so prosperous that he began the publication, in 1739, of a little paper called at first "*Geschichts-schreiber*," later entitled "*Berichte*," which increased in size and in the number of its subscribers until just before the Revolution, it had a circulation of over 4000, not only in Pennsylvania but in Maryland and Virginia. A most interesting collection of the opinions of Christopher Saur could be made from its pages, for the Germantown printer usually accompanied the recital of news with remarks—critical, sarcastic, admonitory or approving, as the case seemed to him to require; through its columns he conducted his numerous and lively controversies with persons opposed to him for business or religious or political reasons. Here he debated the wrongfulness of war, even a defensive one upon the Indians, or opposed the Charity School project, or that of a "man-made" ministry, or reproved the Germans for any complicity or compromise with slavery. In 1743, five years after the founding of the German press, Saur had the enterprise to publish the first edition of the great "*Germantown Bible*," a stately quarto of 1200 pages, the first Bible to be printed in America in any European tongue; there were nu-

merous editions of it and it was eagerly bought by the German settlers.

Toward the end of Saur's life he interested himself in the question of the abuses of the transportation system and the sufferings of the redemptioners. His son, of the same name, succeeded his father in the printing business, writing when he assumed the management: "I had rather indeed have avoided the burdens and responsibilities of a printer—but I find it laid upon me for God and my neighbor's sake. Although I am not, nor do I hope to be, so richly gifted as my father, I will nevertheless use what is given me—and will not allow this or that to turn me from what I believe to be right and good."

Conrad Weiser, "the Interpreter," who had been a friend of Saur in the old times of the Ephrata Kloster did not long survive him. His letters and journals are not literature at all; they are business memoranda of his journeyings among the Indians and councils with them, but they are invaluable historical material for those perilous and stirring times. The successor of Weiser as Indian negotiator, was Christian Frederick Post, a Moravian missionary; his journal, marvellous in its German-English orthography and simple in the extreme, yet tells a story of dauntless heroism and childlike faith. Thus, being dissuaded from starting on one of his missions, he told the Indian chief Teedyuscung: "If I died in the undertaking, it would be as much for the Indians as the English, and that I hoped that my journey would be of this advantage that it would be the means of saving the lives of many hundreds of the Indians; therefore, I was resolved to go forward, taking my life in my hands, as one ready to part with for their good." On his return, Post wrote: "Thirty-two-nights I lay in the woods; the heavens were my covering. There was nothing that laid so heavy on my heart, as the man that went along with me. He thwarted me in everything I said or did; not that he did it against me, but against the country, on whose business I was sent. The Lord has preserved me through all the dangers and difficulties, that I have ever been under. He directed me according to his will, by his holy spirit. I had no one to converse with but him." And on his second journey: "These three days past were precarious times for us. We were warned not to go far from the house, because the people were possessed with a murdering spirit and with bloody vengeance

were thirsty and drunk. We will remain in stillness, and not look to our own credit. We are in the service of our king and country." But he was always most of all a missionary; thus he notes at a council:

"In discourse, they spoke about preaching, and said, 'They were desirous to hear the word of God; but they were always afraid the English would take that opportunity to bring them into bondage... I told them it might be, that when the peace was firmly established, I would come to proclaim the peace and love of God to them.' Waiting to be ferried over to the fort at Pittsburg, he remarks: 'They sent us but a small allowance; so that it would not serve each round. I tied my belt a little closer, being very hungry, and nothing to eat. It snowed and we were obliged to sleep without any shelter.' The one literary criticism to be made on Post's journals, is that we would fain have less of the turgid speeches in councils and more of the strong heroic writer himself.

It was ten years after this time that Beissel, "Father Friedsam," of the Ephrata Kloster died full of years, and honors in his own peculiar circle. The literary output of this New World monastery consists largely of Beissel's sermons and hymns, and they are as destitute of literary merit as of intelligibility. The *Chronicon Ephratense* is at least more comprehensible, though not remarkably lucid, and mostly given over to the recitation of the personal and theological squabbles of the community.

In the fourth decade of the century, the ecclesiastical organizations of the Old World suddenly awoke to the fact that there was a large field for missionary work among the German settlers in America and within a few years of each other, there came to these shores representatives of the Protestant and Catholic Churches to organize their respective adherents. The outstanding personalities, from a literary point of view, among these missionaries are Muhlenberg, the Patriarch of the Lutherans, and the Moravians, Zinzendorf and Spangenberg. Muhlenberg in particular wrote frequent and detailed reports to the authorities of the Pietistic University at Halle who had sent him out and these—the so-called "*Hallesche Nachrichten*"—are of much more interest and value than the somewhat similar "*Uralsperger Nachrichten*" which have been mentioned in connection with the Salzburgers and their settlement in Georgia. Muhlenberg traveled

all over that portion of the colonies where German settlements were to be found: from Georgia and Virginia to the Mohawk Valley of New York where many of the descendents of Queen Anne's colonists had taken refuge; he was an observant, brilliant and devoted man and his accounts of other than ecclesiastical matters must have been interesting reading for the fathers in Halle as they are to readers of the present day. Here is a sketch from the time of the French and Indian War:

"In the summer of the year 1755 the English Gen. Braddock, with his army was beaten in the wilderness by the French and hostile Indians, because the Englishmen fought according to European military science and the Indians according to American. . . The savages attacked a house and murdered the father and son in their barbarous fashion but preserved the lives of the two little girls, namely Barbara, aged 12, and Regina, nearly 10; bound and dragged them aside into the wilderness and left some Indians to watch them. When at last they reached the residence of these wild tribes, they were scattered, the one with one family, the other with another several miles off. For it was the custom among these tribes, when parents lose their children in war, to supply their places by captives or prisoners. This pitiable life and captivity she and the other little girl endured for over nine years and knew not if she should ever return. During the first terrible event through which she lost father, mother, brother and sister, she was actually stunned. but when this miserable way of living had become to her second nature and the powers of her soul again awakened, the first things that came to her mind were the prayers, texts and hymns which she had learned from her dear parents. She said that innumerable times in her captivity she had repeated her prayers kneeling under the trees; and the child kneeling beside her had prayed too, and in the last years almost always with a little assurance and a flickering hope that she would return to Christian people and be redeemed from captivity. Amongst others, these two hymns were a continual comfort and they still are: namely, first, "Jesus Will I Ever Love," and "Alone, Yet Not Alone Am I." When at length, the hostile savages in the past year, chiefly through the means of the brave and wise Col. Bouquet and the army under his command were put to flight, their homes attacked and they forced to make peace and give up their Christian captives; behold, among others Re-

gina and her little charge were also delivered up. Whereupon a very noteworthy thing occurred: namely, when a great crowd of prisoners were brought to Col. Bouquet while still in the Indian country and the most of them without clothing, there was discovered in the colonel as well as in his people a pitying humanity so that they cut up their coats and shirts, yea, even their blankets to give the poor creatures the most necessary clothing, for besides it was winter. The kindly Col. Bouquet then brought the flock of former prisoners from the heathen country to the first English fortress of the Ohio, called Fort Pitt. From Fort Pitt the flock of the ransomed were brought in to the province of Pennsylvania to a small town called Carlisle and notice was put in all newspapers that whosoever had lost friends, relatives, husbands, wives or children in the war should come there and declare marks of recognition. Therefor on this errand the aforesaid poor widow and her (now only) son traveled thither and inquired of the Commission for her little girl Regina, describing her appearance when between 9 and 10 years old. But she could find no one resembling her among the prisoners, for Regina was now 18 years old, large and strong, dressed like an Indian and speaking the Indian language. The Commissioner asked the mother, if she had any way to recognize her daughter. The mother answered in German, her daughter had often sung the hymns: "Alone, Yet Not Alone," and "Jesus Will I Ever Love." Scarcely had the widow said this when Regina sprang out from the crowd, recited the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and these two hymns; then the mother and daughter fell upon each other's neck, wept tears of joy and the mother hastened home with her newly recovered daughter... In February, 1765, the widow with her daughter came to me and said, the daughter since her return had been worrying her about a book in which the Lord Jesus spoke so kindly to men and men could speak with him, meaning the Holy Bible, and a hymn-book; and for this end they had come down 60 or 70 miles. When they had with joy received a Bible I said, she must open it and read to me the first passage she found. She opened it and finding the first chapter of the book of Tobit, read me clearly, beautifully and most movingly, the second verse: "He was taken prisoner in the time of Salmanezer the king of Assyria. And although he was a captive among strangers, yet did he not fall away from God's Word."

Zinzendorf during his brief stay in America did and wrote little that was permanent; besides the home missionary work of the Moravians among the pioneers, and their Indian work, Zinzendorf was particularly enthusiastic in promoting the union of all the different and warring German sects in Pennsylvania; and it was for a "Synod" of these bodies held at Lancaster that the Moravian bishop, Spangenberg, wrote a hymn which is the enduring outcome of Count Zinzendorf's premature plan for Christian Union. This hymn: "Die Kirche Christ die Er geweiht," has been translated as "The Church of Christ, Which He Has Hallowed Here" and in this form is found in modern English hymn-books.

Theological pamphlets concerning the Moravians formed a large part of the issues of the Saur press; but after the younger man succeeded to its management, it was less controversial in its output and had a wider range of themes. The *Geschichtschreiber*, now become the *Germantäuner Zeitung*, was still prosperous; other editions of the Germantown Bible were published by Christopher Saur, Jr., and from the proceeds of an unexpectedly profitable edition of this he founded the "*Geistliche Magazien*," the first religious periodical of America; this was distributed free. Such secular matters as a grammar to teach English to Germans, a handbook of veterinary medicine, a *Ready Reckoner*, and political pamphlets concerning Franklin issued from this press. Meanwhile other German presses were set up, notably that of Heinrich Miller, who also published a paper and it was in Heinrich Miller's *Staatsbote* that the announcement of the Declaration of Independence was first made. It was from Miller's press that there had been issued the address to the German inhabitants of New York and North Carolina by the officials of the "German Society" and the councils of the German churches which committed them to the patriotic cause and to this party most of the German settlers warmly adhered. But it was an epoch of deeds not words and though the diaries, letters and pamphlets add much that is valuable to our knowledge of what the Germans did in the Revolution, they are of slight literary value.

Another German firm, Steiner & Cist, were printers to the Continental Congress. Saur himself was a conscientious non-resistant; his sons were out-and-out loyalists; and the printing

office with all his business, was wrecked during the Revolutionary storm.

The Moravian custom of keeping a diary of all the happenings in the "church settlements" has given the future historian priceless contemporary documents; often the journals—brief, soldierly jottings—of a man of action gives us a better picture of an event than the account of professed historians—as is the case with Bowman's journal of Clark's march to, and capture of, Vincennes. Steuben's "Rules for the Order and Discipline of the Army of the United States" can scarcely be considered as literature, though it was something far more practical. The same may be said of the Indian grammars, vocabularies and translations of the devoted Moravian missionary Zeisberger.

But even confining this study to Colonial times, enough has been said and cited to show that here is a field of American literary activity almost unknown to the general student, yet full of interest. The few bits of real literature are intermixed, as is the case with the writings in English of the same early period, with much that is of merely antiquarian or historical interest; yet enough remains to warrant its investigation and to repay its study.

Sewickley, Pa.

ARTICLE V.

THE PARABLES AND THEIR INTERPRETATION.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D.

The Parables of Christ are not found scattered throughout the three years of his public ministry. They are found only in two distinct groups, one in Math. 13, Mark 4 and Luke 8, spoken in Galilee about the middle of the second year of his ministry; and a second group, found in Luke 14, 1ff.; in Matt. 20, Mark 10 and Luke 18 and succeeding chapters, all spoken in Perea or during the last week of his ministry in Jerusalem, especially on the third day of this week, Tuesday. The parables in the three Synoptic gospels—there are none in John—scarcely more than a dozen, are not all that Jesus spoke, as we are told in Math. 13, 3, and Mark 4, 2, that he spake "many things" through parables. Even stronger statement is found in Mark 4, 34 and Mark 13, 34. Nor would it be correct to think that this first group of parables had been collected here from various periods of his ministry, for in Matt. 13, 53, there is a formal conclusion to this group, and in the preceding verses Jesus had asked His disciples whether they had understood these things spoken in parables.

The reason for this question is found in the fact that Jesus had made a change in His methods of teaching by the introduction of parables. The disciples at once notice this, and ask Him, Matt. 13, 10, not what these parables mean, but why He had adopted this innovation in His teaching. It is evident from Matt. 13, 2, 34, and Mark 4, 1, that a promiscuous and general audience heard at least this first group, but it is clear from both the actions and the words of Jesus, in Matt. 13, 11, Mark 4, 10, Matt. 13, 36, that these parables were not intended for the general hearer, but solely for the disciples. The explanation given by Jesus Himself, in connection with a quotation from Isaiah 6, 9-10, as found particularly in Mark 4, 12 (cf. Matt. 13, 13 seq. Luke 8, 10), shows that it was Christ's purpose by the parables to reveal thought to the disciples but to conceal thought from the people in general. In fact the parables were all spoken for the particular benefit and instruction of the disciples, not merely the

Twelve, but also for the *μαθηταί* in general, as appears e. g., in Matt. 13, 10 and 36, while Mark 4, 10, shows there were other followers of Jesus privileged to understand these pictures besides the Twelve. Only occasionally is it stated that the audience in general understood Christ when He used parables, the clearest example being Matt. 21, 45; Mark 12, 12; Luke 20, 19. Christ distinctly states that He used parables for the instruction of His followers, but for the confusion of the Jews in general and to prevent their conversion. He is evidently dealing with a class of men from whom, either temporarily or permanently, He proposes to withdraw His grace, as He no longer wishes to cast pearls before the swine. These are not men who had committed the sins against the Holy Ghost, as evidently those representatives of the hierarchy had, who according to Matt. 12, 22 ff., Luke 11, 15, had even declared that Christ had cast out devils through Beelzebub, the prince of devils (cf. Matt. 12, 31-32, Mark 3, 28-30) as for these the possibility of a conversion no longer exists. Cf. Heb. 6, 4-6; 10, 26. God can and does withdraw His grace when His patience is exhausted and His appeals have been too long disregarded.

The change to the teaching in parables occurs at a critical period in Christ's career. A close study of this career shows that Christ, about the middle or toward the close of the second year of His ministry, ceases to a great extent from appealing to the people at large and devotes Himself almost entirely to the instruction of His disciples. Apparently He had concluded that the ideal scheme of revelation to transfer the Old Testament Church as a whole into the New Testament Church would not be realized, on account of the departure of religion of hierarchy and the people from the teachings of Moses and the Prophets, and that accordingly it would be necessary for him to organize an *ecclesiola in ecclesia* with the Twelve as a nucleus. It is accordingly to these and His other followers that His instructions are chiefly directed and not to the people at large. When this latter appears again to be the case, as in His last journey to Jerusalem, it is probable that in Perea especially He was working in new territory. Not that Christ had broken with the whole people: evidently the rupture was between Him and the representatives of the Jewish hierarchy chiefly. For according to Mark 1, 35-39, Luke 4, 42-44, and Matt. 4, 23-25, Christ not only makes a first

circuit of Galilee in company with His disciples, and according to Luke 8, 1-3, a second, and Matt. 9, 35-38, a third; but according to Matt. 10, 1, Mark 6, 1, and Luke 9, 1-6, He in connection with this last journey sends out the Twelve on their first independent missionary journey, for which He gives them full instruction and equipment, and they report to Him of their success in Mark 6, 30-31 and Luke 9, 10. Later, according to Luke 10, 1, He sends out the Seventy, because of the pressure of the work, and these report to Him joyfully as He approaches Jerusalem for the last time, according to Luke 10, 17-24. The situation is then probably this, that Christ has given up all hopes of gaining for His gospel the representatives of the hierarchy, the Scribes, the Pharisees, the Elders, but that He still struggles for the souls of the people, and does so to the end, as appears particularly from His bitter denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees on His last visit to the temple, on the third day of the Passover week, as recorded in Matt. 23, 13-39. This was evidently a part of His last plea of the soul of the people, which did not appear absolutely hopeless, for according to Mark 12, 37, the people gladly heard Him as He put to silence both the Pharisees and the Sadducees, Matt. 22, 15 ff., Mark 12, 13 ff., Luke 20, 20 ff. The "people" (ὄχλος) however, who met Him with favor were evidently not the inhabitants of Jerusalem, but the pilgrims, particularly from Galilee, who had come by the tens of thousands to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover, and large contingents of whom had escorted Him into the city from their place of encampment outside the city, joining Him as He made His official entrance and greeting Him as the Messiah with glad "Hosannahs," who were however not the Jerusalemites, who a few days later cried out "Crucify him!" There are no evidences that Christ, with the exception of a few special friends, had ever found favor with the inhabitants of the Jerusalem, whose interests were entirely bound up with the hierarchy.

The situation was then this, that Christ is now instructing His disciples for their special work of helping Him to win the people away from the influence of the religious leaders of the day. Much of this instruction pertains to the immediate work they were to do as the coadjutors of Jesus and before His death, as when He tells them that they are not to go to the Samaritans or to the Gentiles, Matt. 10, 5, and to confine their efforts to the Jews,

which part of these instructions refer to their work in later life as outlined by the Great Commission, cf. e. g. Matt. 10, 16 ff.

The parables are a part of these instructions. Nothing could be further from the truth than to think the purpose of the parables is to teach mere abstract truth without any special relation to the time and occasion on which they were uttered. On the contrary, they are concrete instructions given to the disciples in their missionary work and dealing with the problems that then confront them. The parables are chiefly missionary in character, especially the first group. The Parable of the Sower tells the new missionaries that they cannot expect the same results in all cases and shows that the trouble does not lie in what they preach but in the different reception their preaching will find; the Parable of the Tares in the Wheat tells them that they will not find only perfect followers of their message, but also some hypocrites; the Parable of the Seed cast into the ground shows that the growth in the Kingdom of God will not depend on their efforts; the Parable of the Mustard Seed tells them that their small and humble beginnings in the face of the opposition of the hierarchy, will result at last in a mighty extension of the Kingdom; the Parable of the Leaven shows how this gospel they preach transforms the whole man and all mankind; the Parable of the Treasure and of the Pearl shows the high estimate to be put on this gospel.

The second group of parables are all for the special instruction of the disciples and consist largely in warnings against the religious teachers of the day. The Parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Penny, the Prodigal Son, were occasioned by the murmurings of the Pharisees because Jesus had eaten with publicans and sinners, and were intended to show the disciples that God and the angels rejoiced at the repentance of a sinner, Luke 15, 1 sqq. The Parable of the Unjust Steward, Luke 16, 1-13, has anything but a merely academic purpose. The religious hierarchy in Israel had proved unfaithful to the trust given them by the Old Testament revelation, and therefore were to lose their leadership, although their shrewdness in utilizing that position for their personal gain offers the Lord an opportunity to instruct His disciples on the proper use of this world's goods. The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Luke 16, 14-31, is expressly directed against the greed of the Pharisees; the Parable

of the Importunate Widow, Luke 18, 1-8, is an encouragement to the disciples to seek divine help in their great work; the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, Luke 18, 9-14, is directed against the cardinal falsehood of the Pharisaic system, righteousness by works. The Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard, informs the disciples that while in response to the question of Peter, Matt. 19, 27, they can expect great rewards in heaven for the sacrifices the disciples bring on earth in the interests of the Kingdom of God, cf. especially Matt. 19, 28, that no such special rewards can be expected here in the church militant, but that each worker in the cause of Christ, whether a veteran or a beginner, shall get the same "penny," i. e., the same grace, the same word of God, the same sacraments, the same spiritual blessings. There will be a difference in the reward of the faithful in the church triumphant, but not in the church militant. This is the double answer given to Peter, the one part in simple words, the other in a parable. The parables spoken the last public teaching day of Jesus, the Tuesday of Passion week, such as the Two Sons, Matt. 21, 28, sqq.; the Wicked Husbandmen, Matt. 21, 33 ff, Mark 12, 1 sqq.; Luke 20, 9 sqq.; scarcely require any comment, as they all expose the hypocrisy of the Pharisees for the instruction of the disciples.

It is accordingly not surprising that the doctrinal contents of the Parables are comparatively insignificant. The fundamental doctrines of Christianity, such as the Atonement, the Divinity of Christ, the lessons of Faith are not touched. More incidentally do we occasionally find these essentials involved, as the all-comprehending and forgiving love of the Father in the Prodigal Son. The Parables are missionary instructions given to the disciples primarily for the work that was awaiting them, both before and after the death of Christ. Only when seen in their real historical background and setting can these masterpieces of the greatest of teachers be correctly understood and appreciated.

Columbus, Ohio.

ARTICLE VI.

MARTIN LUTHER IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES W. SUPER, D.D.

An article in a recent number of the *Harvard Theological Review* by Professor Platner of the Andover Theological Seminary, opens with the following paragraphs: "Luther is a fascinating subject for the historian. Not only does the personality of the man himself offer exceptional attractions, but so too does the age in which he lived; for then society, politics, and religion were all in the melting pot, out of which in time was to issue the modern world." "The favorite assertion of many German writers that Luther was the Reformation is often disputed, yet the statement is not half so exaggerated as it sounds, for if ever the spirit of a great movement which permanently affected the welfare of mankind got itself embodied in the person of one man, that movement was the Protestant revolution and that man was Friar Martin." The article contains many dicta which show a remarkable grasp of the subject under consideration. "The monk of Wittenberg unquestionably did influence the course of politics and of social life in modern Europe, but yet, when all has been said, it remains true that his principal contribution to the world was not in either of these fields, important as they may be, but rather in the field of religion which is the most important of all." "He will always occupy a unique position in the history of his time, and every comparison between him and other leaders in the end serves only to establish his superiority." "Luther was the founder of the theological method, not the framer of a system, and while it is no doubt true that he was led to take positions some of which are no longer tenable, yet the underlying principles on which his method is based, and the method itself, are very much alive in modern Protestantism."

The same number also contains an article by Professor Christie of the Meadville Theological Seminary in which he says: "America was dominated by Calvin, but there is small reward in going back to Calvin, who applied the logic of a legal mind to a subject beyond the sphere of jurisprudence. Luther, on the

other hand, was trying to utter the apprehensions of a great heart. Calvin's thought is dead. Luther's heart still throbs. We shall perhaps understand our hearts more clearly if we apply religious psychology to his." Both these articles were called forth by the appearance of two recent biographies of Luther, the one by Dr. McGiffert of Union Theological Seminary, the other by Dr. Smith of Amherst College. We may not be willing to go quite so far as to agree with Professor Christie that Calvin's thought is dead. But it must be regarded as a highly significant fact that the two most comprehensive studies of the great German reformer that have appeared in the United States were produced in what may be called Calvinistic laboratories. It should also be stated in this connection that in 1912 there appeared a small volume entitled *The Continental Reformers*, by Dr. Alfred Plummer which is the most lucid presentation in English of the salient facts in the life of the three men—Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli—with whom it deals, that has come into my hands. It is well known to every reader of the religious and semi-religious periodicals that within the last several years Luther and his times have been the theme of scores of books large and small, as well as articles without number. If we did not have the evidence before our eyes we could scarcely believe it possible that opinions so completely at variance with each other, so utterly irreconcilable, could be formed about the same man and upon the same evidence as we find in the recent books upon Luther. One needs not to be very familiar with the rise of Lutheranism to be able to understand why bitter animosities should be engendered between the defenders of the old order and the champions of the new faith. But that writers like Janssen and Pastor and particularly Denifle continue to appear whose chief aim seems to be to keep alive the acerbities of controversy, is, to say the least, surprising. It is doubtful whether any other man in the entire history of our race has had so many-sided a career as Friar Martin. He passed through almost the whole gamut of human experience. He touched the life about him at every point. Born of poor parents, a charity scholar, he made himself the companion of princes and potentates. To almost every crowned head of Europe he was an object of fear or hatred, often of both. Without being a politician or a statesman he influenced and was the adviser of more than one crowned head.

Brought up a strict Catholic and taught to revere the pope as holding the keys of heaven and earth, he learned to hate the papal hierarchy with all the intensity of his vehement nature. Steeped in the theology of the Middle Age he turned his back upon it and asserted for himself the privilege of doing his own thinking, and believing only what his reason told him was the truth. Though sometimes coarse in speech his heart was as tender as a woman's. Though brought up on the Latin language, so to speak, he emancipated himself from its shackles and made himself such a master of his native tongue that he has probably never had an equal among his countrymen. The causes of the remarkable revival of interest in Luther are mainly two: one national, the other international. About three score of years ago a Frenchman named de Gobineau, published a work in which he undertook to prove that all progress is due to the Germanic race. It did not attract much attention for almost fifty years and was not translated into German until near the close of the nineteenth century. Its effect was doubtless the more powerful because of the high tribute paid to the German people by a foreigner and a Roman Catholic. It is to be noted however that he claims descent from Teutonic ancestors. De Gobineau's theory has recently been elaborated by a number of German and English scholars. We are now assured that all or nearly all the great writers and artists of France, and Spain and Italy as well as of other countries had German blood in their veins and owed their pre-eminence to this fact. This theory has been most fully elaborated and followed to its extreme limits by Houston Stewart Chamberlain, an Englishman by birth, trained in French schools, and later a member of the faculty of the University of Vienna in his book, *Die Grunlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, recently translated into English. As the Frenchman's theory became better known among the Germans they began to recognize that fact that Luther was the first great representative of what we may call Germanism. The realization of German unity under the leadership of Bismarck, so long desired and so vainly striven for by German patriots, has likewise had much influence in strengthening the national consciousness of the German people. It is greatly to the credit of many men on both sides of the North Sea that they are endeavoring to allay animosities and to promote good feeling among their countrymen by pointing to

the common origin of the Germanic peoples. The international cause is the deepening of religious convictions throughout well-nigh the entire world. Thinkers almost everywhere have come to realize that fact that the pursuit of material objects is after all unsatisfying and that man's spiritual needs are crying aloud for satisfaction. The chief exponent of this doctrine is Professor Rudolf Eucken. It is a highly significant phenomenon in the life of our era that he should receive the Nobel prize for literature in 1909, when in truth his writings are not literary but philosophical. The following are some of his postulates: "In the spiritual life of the present day, molecular transformations are taking place, inconspicuous at first but continually increasing which will eventually burst upon our view, and which will necessarily provoke essential changes in the entire conditions of life. To-day this movement is still an undercurrent, and on the surface the tide flows in the opposite direction. But more and more the undercurrent is rising to the surface, and unless every indication fails, it will soon come into control." This tendency is caused "by the increasing dissatisfaction with modern civilization, or at least with those aspects of civilization which now occupy the surface of life." "We work and work, and know not to what end; for in giving up eternity, we have also lost every inner bond of the ages and all power of comprehensive view. Without a guiding star we drift on the ocean of time."

"It was a main point of religion, especially of the Christian religion, not to accept and recognize man as experience presents him, but to require of him a complete transformation, an inner birth." "Just because our inner life is ever growing more and more intense and more laborious we must unconditionally demand that it be given an aim and a new meaning. Therefore in all deeper souls to-day is stirring a demand for an inner uplift of human nature, for a new idealism, and this demand will necessarily have to seek an alliance with religion. No matter how many opponents religion may still encounter, nevertheless stronger than all opponents, stronger even than all intellectual difficulties, is the necessity of the spiritual self-preservation of humanity and of man." The great interest that Henri Bergson with his defense of intuition as the true life impetus rather than the postulates of science is attracting is another noteworthy sign of our time, a manifestation of the same tendency of which Pro-

fessor Eucken is so fully convinced. It may be remarked further that such terms as infidel, atheist, agnostic, and others of similar import have almost disappeared from current literature. To the end of his days Herbert Spencer denied and often with much heat the charge of being a materialist. Such radicals as the late Colonel Ingersoll would probably attract but little attention in our day. Almost every thinking man has become convinced that there is so much vital truth in the Christian religion that it is unprofitable to spend time and energy in combating errors that have crept into it. The renewed interest in Luther is not confined to his coreligionists. It extends to men of other creeds and no creed; it is particularly evident among Catholic writers. When reading some of the latter we often seem to be transported to the times in which Luther lived and to be set down among his enemies of the sixteenth century. The acrimonious tone in which most of these authors express themselves may be taken as evidence of a consciousness that their cause is losing ground. When two men are engaged in a controversy and one of them becomes angry it is a pretty sure sign that he is conscious of getting the worst of it. Notwithstanding the optimistic tone in which Catholic dignitaries sometimes indulge in their public utterances, it is plain from many occurrences that they are conscious of an adverse current in public opinion. In France the historic church has been deprived of almost all power. The case is not widely different in Italy. This fact was clearly evinced a few years ago in the controversy over the Methodist propaganda in Rome during the course of which several American prelates indulged in the bitterest denunciation and invective. In German lands Catholicism, or at least ultramontaniam, is slowly waning. The same statement may be made of almost every country on the face of the earth. It is therefore perfectly natural, perhaps even justifiable from their standpoint, that men who are prepossessed with the idea that the salvation of the world depends upon the profession of their faith should employ strong language when dealing with the arch heretic. There is a marked difference in this respect between the Catholic historians who discuss Luther and the Anglican writers who have in recent years treated the Wesleyan movement. The tone of the latter is almost without exception kindly and appreciative. It has even been affirmed by several British

writers that John Wesley was one of their three or four great countrymen of the eighteenth century. While therefore the various divisions of Protestantism are drawing nearer together, the breach between these and ultramontaniam is becoming wider. An ecclesiastical hierarchy is an anachronism. The trend of modern thought is toward a wider democracy in matters of religion as well as of politics. That a pope who is generally a man of limited education and narrow experience should claim the right to prescribe what people in every part of the world should read and even what they should think is the height of absurdity. That Luther held some of the beliefs which were the heritage of Jews and Christians from the earliest times nobody denies. He had no doubts about the existence of witches and witchcraft. But neither had John Wesley though he lived two centuries later; nor the great mass of mankind until recently. To Luther a personal devil was as real as any living man. This malignant spirit could take almost any form he pleased in order the more successfully to circumvent and injure men. He could ruin the peasant's crop by blight and tempest. He could bring disease upon the peasant's cattle or upon his family. He could and often did delude men and lead them to commit crimes. Few people in our day believe in a devil as Luther believed, and equally few deny the existence of malevolent spirits such as we find portrayed in Goethe's *Faust*. But unlike almost all of his contemporaries Luther did not fear the devil no matter how many forms he might take or in how many guises he might appear. He felt that God was for him; that it therefore made no difference who was against him, even if it were a legion of devils. It was this absolute fearlessness, this confidence in the help of the Almighty that strengthened and supported him in every trial and temptation. That he was not naturally superstitious is evident from his disbelief in magic, in ghosts, in premonitions, in astrology and in oracles. Many of the most enlightened men of his age had faith in some or all of these supernatural manifestations; Luther rejected them all. When we consider the environment in which he was brought up our wonder is that there was so little superstition in him. The fact that he shared some of the credulities of his day was one source of his power and influence. The greatest superstition that Luther and his coreligionists had to overcome and which he overcame successfully

was an idolatrous veneration for the institutions and usages of the historic church. He learned to distinguish clearly between ecclesiasticism and religion. In what did religion consist according to the belief of his youthful contemporaries? It consisted almost solely in the worship of the Virgin and of the Saints, of relics and pictures and images; in pilgrimages, in the giving of alms and in indulgences: that is in the mechanical preformance of good works. Or as professor Boehmer in *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung* puts it,—Christianity is whatever the church teaches, does, requires and permits. When we read how the pagans of ancient and modern times sought to avert the wrath and to win the favor of their gods we find exactly the same state of mind among the christians of Luthers' day. What was christianity according to Luther? To seek and to find God; to love, to honor and to trust him; to strive daily to keep his commandments as laid down in his Holy Word. The Christian believer must feel that he has direct access to his Heavenly Father through the mediation of his son Jesus Christ. Public worship, the sacraments, preaching, and a few other usages practiced by the Apostles are an aid to christian living; but they are not essential thereto. A man's salvation is a matter that is entirely dependent upon himself; a question that must be settled between God and every individual man. This is the essence of Protestantism and defined and proclaimed by Luther; it is the foundation upon which all the Reformed churches are built. The charge has often been brought against Luther, and the charge has been repeated with especial virulence within the last few years, that he was often coarse and even obscene in speech; that he never hesitated to express himself freely upon subjects which are now avoided in decent company even when no woman is present, and that he applied epithets to his adversaries heard only in the lowest company. In considering these accusations several facts are to be taken into account. One is that in his day the utmost plainness of speech prevailed everywhere. There is hardly a writer of ancient or modern times including not a few belonging to the nineteenth century who can not be accused of a plainness of speech condemned before the tribunal of modern taste. This is particularly true of those who have dealt with human motives. Shakespeare is always placed at the head of the world's great poets; yet there are very few of his dramas that can be read en-

tire in a mixed assembly. Goethe's writings contain many passages that are regarded as impure. Nobody accuses Tolstoi of being intentionally lewd; yet it is doubtful whether any of his works has been entirely translated into English. It has been repeatedly affirmed that there are but two great writers, except such as are of very recent date, in whose works not a line occurs at which the most fastidious taste can take umbrage,—Sir Walter Scott and Frederic Schiller. There is also a wide difference in national taste in such matters. The English-speaking people of the present day are exceptionally prudish. Books and articles in large numbers appear almost daily on the Continent without provoking adverse criticism that could not be published on the other side of the Channel. It would be unjust however, to infer from this fact that continental morality is lower than it is on the other side of the Channel or in the English-speaking parts of America. That Luther was not a sinner above his countrymen in this respect at once becomes evident when we see some of the epithets applied to him by many of the men who remained true to the historic Church. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Furthermore, we must not interpret German modes of speech of three or four centuries ago, by present-day standards. Many words were quite in order that are now banished from reputable society. It is by *The Table Talk* that Luther is made to appear in the worst light. It is now known that this talk underwent two or more revisions and has come down to us through devious channels. That most of the recorded sayings express Luther's sentiments is not doubtful; that they give his exact words is extremely problematical. These conversations were originally not intended for the public. But when the reporters found that many persons outside of the limited circle of participants were interested in them, they to some extent regulated the supply by the demand. The output was spiced to suit the general palate. A remark made in Latin was sometimes turned into such German as would give it the greatest pungency. In any case, whether the conversation was in Latin or in German it was not intended for the public eye. The oft-quoted saying attributed to Luther:

"Wer nicht liebt Wein, Weiber und Gesang,
Der bleibt ein Narr sein lebenlang,"

is almost certainly not original with Luther. Professor Boehmer says it was first used by J. H. Voss in 1777; but when asked to give its source he was unable to do so. Luther may have said something of the kind. The probability however is that he was referring to a well known Italian proverb and not expressing his own sentiments. It is to Luther's credit that he was conscious of his shortcomings and freely admitted his infirmities of temper. He never pretended to be better than he was, or to be a model for anyone. He often said: "Anybody may attack me who wants to. I do not profess to be a saint." Besides, from his fortieth year he was hardly ever in good health, in pain a great deal of the time, and in a physical condition that made him irritable and his excitable temper uncontrollable. In these comparatively quiet times it is easy to find fault with harsh words uttered centuries ago, under the most exasperating conditions, by a man who was naturally impetuous. It is well to remember that self-control means something very different to different persons. This fact is forcibly illustrated by an anecdote related of the late Dr. Tyng. On a certain occasion a friend of his felt it his duty to advise him to control his temper. "Young man," was the reply, "I control more temper in an hour than you do in a year." That Luther's disciples have no wish to conceal the master's shortcomings is evident from the circumstance that almost from the beginning of his career they gave freely to the public all his utterances when he did not do so himself. And to this day every new find is at once given to the press. It is as certain as anything incapable of demonstration can be that if he could be consulted on such a matter he would unhesitatingly say: "Tell the truth, the whole truth; conceal nothing."

When Luther indulged in coarse language and violent invective he was always the party attacked. In his earlier controversies with the ecclesiastical authorities he entreated again and again to be shown wherein he was wrong. But he was always treated as a mischief-maker and a fool. Eventually he became the storm-center of the most virulent and acrimonious verbal conflict that ever raged in Europe. In almost every case his opponents were the aggressors. They said everything that would hurt his feelings, impeach his honor, or besmirch his character. They spared neither the man himself, nor his wife, nor his children, nor his parents, nor his friends, nor his sovereign. It is

no light task to put one's self in position to affirm what Luther said and what he did not say. In non-essentials he was not always consistent and a remark taken out of its connection may as easily mislead us as a passage of Holy Writ. There is as yet no definite edition of his works. The most complete is that published at Erlangen in which his German writings fill sixty-seven volumes and his Latin writings about half as many. A critical edition began to appear at Weimar in 1883 of which about thirty volumes have thus far been issued. A man who has nothing else to do might make his way through this mass of matter in a few years. That would not signify however that he understood it. That not only requires a thorough knowledge of ecclesiastical Latin, but also of the German language of four centuries ago. There have been published more than two hundred biographies of Luther; these are not only in German but in Latin, in English, in French, in Danish, in Swedish, in Italian, in Russian, in Polish and perhaps in other languages. I find no mention of Spanish. There are a number of novels dealing with Luther and his times and not less than a dozen Luther-dramas. In addition to all this voluminous matter, there are pamphlets and articles almost without number in which are set forth the minutest details of his life, his opinions on every subject upon which he expressed himself, the genealogy of his family upwards and downwards as far as it can be traced. So enormous has Luther-literature become and is still growing that it is doubtful whether the life of an ordinary man would be long enough to read it, if we include what Luther himself wrote; for, be it remembered, that only a thorough scholar is equal to the task. When we are trying to form a just estimate of Luther's mentality we need always to keep in mind that probably no man in the history of the world was so ardently loved and so bitterly hated; so greatly admired and so deeply despised, and so persistently maligned. Nor have his enemies ceased their efforts to the present day. Every now and then the attacks upon him are renewed; nor does it seem probable that the warfare will ever end. We need to keep in mind that he never hesitated to express himself on every question that came before him. That a man who was so versatile, so ready with tongue or pen, so prone to yield to the impulse of the passing occasion, should not do and say things that upon cold-blooded examination might prove to

have been unwise, or at least injudicious, can not be expected.

When we consider the fact that Luther was essentially a man of action we are astonished at his productivity. Hence he often did not have the time to reconcile what he had said or even written on one occasion with what he had written on another. Most of his utterances were called forth by some particular event or emergency. There have been very few thinkers, men whose lives were passed chiefly in silent contemplation, who were the same at sixty as at twenty-five. We always do well to remember that "a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds." A change of opinion is not the same as a change of principles, nor is it necessarily a deterioration of character.

Someone has said that three co-operating agencies are necessary to the production of a great oration,—the speaker, the subject and the occasion. With equal truth it can be said that three concomitant forces are necessary to produce great events,—the man, the purpose and the times. Wicliff might have brought about great changes in the religious life of his age if he had had the aid of the printing press in appealing to a large constituency. The same lack was likewise a handicap to Huss, as were also probably his native language and the want of a patron sufficiently powerful to protect him against the treachery of his enemies. Savonarola would have accomplished more than he did if his lot had been cast among a more serious-minded people. Luther was not only a man of transcendent ability, he had likewise the aid of the new and powerful agency, the printing press, for the dissemination of his teachings. He was also the subject of a sovereign who was sufficiently enlightened to ask for fair play and able to protect him against the machinations of those who sought to destroy him. When in 1520 Leo X excommunicated Luther and ordered his works to be burned and forbade their publication, sale, or distribution, he produced precisely the opposite result to that intended. The demand increased enormously both in Germany and in foreign countries. Printed books intended for popular perusal before Luther's time were chiefly chap-boks, manuals of popular medicine, almanacs, jest-books, and a few lives of saints. But in 1519 there were recorded 111 issues from the press of which almost one-half were writings of Luther. In 1523, of about 500 issues from the press 183 bear Luther's name. Cochlaeus, a violent opponent of Lu-

ther says: "Luther's New Testament was multiplied by the printers in a most wonderful degree, so that even shoemakers and women and every lay person acquainted with the German type read it greedily as the foundation of all truth, and by repeatedly reading it impressed it on their memory. By this means they acquired in a few months so much knowledge that they ventured to dispute, not only with Catholic laymen, but even with ministers and doctors of theology, about faith and the gospel. How anyone can honestly maintain that the historic Church, if it had been let alone would have effected all the reforms that were really necessary is hard for anyone to believe unless it is to his interest to do so. The position is against all evidence and analogy. For more than two hundred years efforts were put forth almost continually, now in one country, now in another, but they were always suppressed and came to nothing. The recent Old Catholic movement was a step in the same direction, but only a short step. Wiclif was not the first but he was the earliest redoubtable champion of the rights and privileges of the individual and the State against the encroachments of the Church. In his book on *The Kingdom of God* he distinctly maintains that all authority is founded in grace. He attempts to establish a theory of direct relation between man and God, thus sweeping away the very foundations on which the medieval Church is built. His theory was hardly different from Luther's Justification by Faith. It was the wealth and worldliness of the prelate that robbed them of their spiritual authority. Wiclif maintained that the property of the Church might be seized, and employed for State purposes. His century also was marked by outbreaks among peasants and laborers against the oppression of the clergy. Wiclif too like Luther begged to be refuted out of the Scriptures, and promised to yield if they were against him. When summoned before an ecclesiastical council he replied: "I am always glad to explain my faith to anyone, and above all to the Bishop of Rome, for I take it for granted that if it be orthodox he will confirm it, if it be erroneous he will correct it. I assume too that as the chief vicar of Christ upon earth the Bishop of Rome is of all mortal men most bound to the law of Christ's Gospel, for among the disciples of Christ a majority is not reckoned by simply counting heads in the fashion of this world, but according to the imitation of Christ on either side.

Now Christ during His life upon earth was of all men the poorest, casting from Him all worldly authority. I deduce from these premises as a simple counsel of my own that the Pope should surrender all temporal authority to the civil power and advise his clergy to do the same."

It is not possible at this time to form a clear conception of the effects of the religious revolution upon the morals of the German people. But we need to accept only the testimony of Catholic writers to be convinced that many of the monasteries were veritable dens of iniquity and sexual immorality. Besides, they fostered idleness. When then their inmates were turned loose on the community the consequences can easily be imagined. That the secularization of church property benefitted the people at large, especially the peasantry, is very improbable. We have a good deal of direct testimony to the influence of the reform upon the higher education. Professor Paulsen cites some illuminating figures bearing upon this point. During the third decade of the sixteenth century the university at Erfurt almost ceased to exist for lack of students. During the same period the number of students at Leipzig fell to about one-fourth of the usual number. Rostock had no students in the year 1529. From 1529 to 1539 Greifswald was in a comatose condition. The university at Cologne was from first to last a vigorous and bitter opponent of religious innovations. Nevertheless the matriculations between 1527 and 1543 never reached a hundred although the usual attendance ranged between 300 and 400. Vienna, that generally numbered about 600 matriculants per annum, was almost deserted. During the years 1527 to 1530 the number of students averaged about thirty annually. Heidelberg and Basel were for some years without students or lecturers. The university at Freiburg and also that at Tuebingen, which were under Austrian tutelage seem to have suffered less than those named above; that at Ingolstadt under the rectorship of Eck less than any. The number of matriculants averaged 136 between the years 1518 and 1550, which was only 36 less than during the preceding period of about the same length. It is evident that the Catholic universities suffered a marked diminution in the number of students; some of them almost as much as those that accepted the new doctrine. There must have been other than religious influences at work. The term *university* is apt to mis-

lead the modern reader who knows what a German university now is. The old time institutions bearing this title were very modest affairs, and consisted almost entirely of students and lecturers. It was therefore an easy matter to found one, or to disband it, or to transfer it to another city. Almost any municipality could provide a few rooms in which lectures could be delivered, and the plant was complete. It is unjust to lay to the charge of Luther and Lutheranism the demoralization into which learning fell at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Almost from the beginning of his public career he strove to impress upon the secular authorities the importance of promoting education. As early as 1524 he wrote to various city councils urging them to establish public schools and public libraries. That he was far in advance is shown among other things by his advocacy of compulsory school attendance. If he also urged compulsory attendance at public worship it was in order that the people might learn the true doctrine. We should remember moreover that he did this in an age when a large majority of the people could be enlightened in no other way because a knowledge of reading and writing was limited to a comparatively small number. He never advocated a penalty for professing Romanism. There is a wide difference between compelling men to listen to the exposition of doctrine and constraining them to profess it under penalty of death. Melancthon is called *Praeceptor Germaniae* because of his unwearied efforts to improve the general education of his countrymen. He was the first man of modern times to interest himself in this problem. Education from top to bottom, until within the memory of men still living took almost no account of the present and was founded essentially upon the past. It was no more conservative in Germany than in other countries; less so in fact. Professor Paulsen gives a brief account of the original equipment of Halle. It was meager enough verily, yet he does not hesitate to call it the first university of the world in the modern sense. He thinks the financial resources of Oxford were perhaps a hundredfold greater. "But what was Oxford compared to Halle?" We find an answer to this question in part if we read the reminiscences of the Wesleys or of Edward Gibbon. Although the religious reform in France was virtually extinguished in blood during the sixteenth and seventeenth century that kingdom made no educational progress until after the Revo-

lution. In 1675 Louis XIV complains that the methods of instructing the young are very inadequate. They learn at most a little Latin, but they know neither history nor geography nor the sciences that have a practical value. A contemporary writer relates that during the eight years of his studies the name of Henry IV was never mentioned, and that at seventeen he did not know how or at what epoch the House of Bourbon came to the throne. Rollin, a great authority in his time and long after, has no place in his curriculum for modern languages, nor for modern history, nor for the sciences. He declares that pupils must spend so much time in the study of antiquity that none is left for modern affairs. It is by no means certain that the sufferings of the German people were more bitter than those of France although their economic losses were much greater. probably no people of any country have in the same length of time endured greater mental anguish than the French Protestants during the two centuries beginning about the middle of the sixteenth. Germany saved the cause for which Protestantism stands, but the price paid was fearfully high. If Catholicism had finally triumphed that country would have performed the part that for two or three centuries has been played by Austria and its closely related Bavaria. What has the Catholic portion of the latter country and the whole population of the former contributed to the progress of the human race? The little State of Wurtemberg gave birth to more men who have profoundly influenced human thought, in half a century, than German Austria and Bavaria during their entire existence. Education for the masses has nowhere been encouraged by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. If such had been the case Italy or France would have taken the lead. Spain is the most thoroughly Romanist country in the world. What has Spain ever done and what is she doing at this day for the promotion of knowledge? Although one of the richest countries in the world in natural resources her people are steeped in ignorance and poverty. In the realm of knowledge Spain counts for less than any of the Scandinavian countries, less than Holland, or Switzerland, or Scotland. While the preeminence of Germany is not wholly owing to Protestantism, directly and avowedly, it is at least due to her emancipation from the thralldom of a reactionary hierarchy. It is in accordance with the fitness of things that the country which gave birth to the

first great religious reformer of modern times and the greatest of them all should likewise develop a system of education that has been copied more or less closely by almost every country on the face of the earth.

"Luther's influence on the religious and political ideas, on literature, on social life, on the map of Europe, has been enormous, and this influence has been won—largely without effort on his part—through his massive character; through his sincerity, earnestness, unselfishness; and, above all, through his splendid courage. We may differ widely from some of his opinions, but we live in a world which is a wiser and a better world because of Luther's work."—Plummer.

Athens, Ohio.

ARTICLE VII.

THE BOOK OF JOB: A CRITICAL STUDY.

BY WALTER KRUMWEIDE.

The book which has been the object of the critical study embodied in this article derives its name from the principal character of the narrative. In its present form, this title comes to us, not from the Hebrew or LXX versions, but from the Vulgate.

The critical problem of this book does not involve so much the historicity of the main character as it does "the historicity of the events recorded" together with the data and origin. These form the basis and extent of the critical problem.

Job is accepted as an historical character by the most advanced critics who designate him "a real character in popular tradition." The biblical testimony on this point is quite full. Turning to the internal evidence of the book itself, we may point out the "historical character of the prologue and the epilogue." Then we note the lack of all symbolism in the names of the three friends, of Elihu, and of the daughters of Job. We would point also to the references to the land of Uz, etc. All these indicate the historical character of Job. The external biblical evidence is equally strong. In Ezek. 14: 14-20 Job is spoken of as an actual person, and in Jas. 5:11, we read, "Ye have heard of the patience of Job." Of the historicity, then, of the main character there can be and there is admitted to be no doubt.

When we come to the question of date, authorship, and composition we are confronted by a mass of conflicting views. The modern opinion as to the time in which the events of the book took place is practically unanimous. For a time, it is true, it was held that the historical records did not necessitate an early date, but today, even the most critical of scholars, are ready to admit that the events depicted "would stand between chapters 11 and 12 of Genesis as a supplement to the records of the early condition of our race, given by Moses."

In support of this modern position we note the strong internal evidence. "The family life as depicted in the prologue, the extensive ownership of cattle, the offering of the sacrifice by the

head of the family, and the great age to which Job lived point unmistakably to patriarchal times." The Hebrew word for money, *קֶשֶׁטָה*; is employed elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Gen. 33:19 and Josh. 24:32, both of which are accounts of patriarchal times. Again there is little or no trace of any reference to the Mosiac law, or to Israel as an historic nation.

The problem as to the date, and origin of the book presents four theories for our consideration:—

1. The PATRIARCHAL Theory: Those who hold this early date of Job base their position on the testimony of Jewish tradition, as found in the Talmud, and especially upon the character of the book itself.

This view has been advocated by such scholars as Ebrard, Dawson, etc. Dawson designates it "the oldest of the Hebrew books" and says, "I adopt that view of the date of Job which makes it precede the Exodus, because the religious ideas of the book are patriarchal, and it contains no allusions to the Hebrew history or institutions. Were I to suggest an hypothesis as to its origin it would be that it was written or found by Moses when in exile, and published among his countrymen in Egypt, to revive their monotheistic religion and cheer them under the apparent desertion of their God and the evil of their bondage."

To our own mind the evidence on this point is conclusive in spite of the very strong argument derived from the position of Job in the Canon. It is very evident from the book itself that it must have originated in pre-Mosaic times. In the first place "the whole physiognomy of the Book is Arabian, is of the East, and the desert, in its minutest," and all this without "one solitary kind of Jewish life, custom, or mode of thought." Indeed, we have been told by travellers in Arabia, that, with the addition of certain peculiar sounds, the Arab today can be made to adopt this book as a description of his own life.

Again it is very evident that the language employed shows a profound Arabian influence of a very early date, while the Aramaic terms employed are not like those of pre-exilic date, but reflect, in a most remarkable manner, the oldest portions of the Pentateuch.

The internal historical evidence gleaned from the book is no less clear. This has already been mentioned, but we will review it briefly. We note, the great length of Job's life; the use of

קש"מח: as a coin of the time; the absence of sacrifices such as are found in the Pentateuch; the lack of any reference to Israel as a nation with a history; the absence of even the remotest allusion to the Mosaic law; the worship of the sun, moon, and stars, and no mention of idols; "no reference to the Exodus. When it is remembered that no fact in ancient Jewish history is so frequently and prominently referred to in nearly all the Old Testament books, as this, the entire absence of any statement concerning this most important fact in the history of God's chosen people, or allusion to it in Job, is an unanswerable argument in favor of the un-Jewish and pre-Mosaic origin of the Book." Farther we note the silence maintained as to the Holy Land, Jerusalem, the tabernacle, the Temple, or to *Jew* or *Hebrew*. Moreover, the characters remind us strongly of the sons of Abraham and of Esau, while Elihu is called "the Buzite" which would identify him with Nahor, and, from Gen. 22:21, lead us to conclude that he was "a nephew of Abraham."

Such considerations as these have led Ewald to assert "very positively that in all the descriptions of manners and customs, domestic, social and political, and even in the indirect allusions and illustrations, the genuine coloring of the age of Job, that is of the period between Abraham and Moses, is very faithfully observed." Now we know that no writer can successfully maintain "atmosphere" for any lengthy composition without betraying himself unless he lived in the period portrayed. Moreover, Renan, in his discussion of Job, is correct when he says, "antiquity had no idea of what we call local coloring." Thus the very character of the book itself, its own testimony forces us to accept it as a pre-Mosaic work.

But the external biblical testimony for pre-Mosaic origin is equally strong. It is very evident that the Song of Deborah, the Mosaic Psalms, and other portions of the Pentateuch were influenced by the Book of Job. Indeed, both Havernick and Lee show that the Pentateuch as a whole, Proverbs, and the Song of Solomon, all borrow from Job. Lee brings to our notice "a vast number of parallel passages . . . from Ruth, Samuel, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Micah, and Nahum, all of which are probably, and some of them demonstrably, copied from Job." Even Renan was led to conclude that "the description of Wisdom (ch. xxviii) is the

original source of the idea which we find in Proverbs (ch. viii, ix.)...."

2. The SOLOMONIC Theory: The supporters of this theory claim that the book was written during the reign of Solomon. This theory has been advocated by Luther, Delitzsch, Raven, etc. The arguments for this view are,—it fits well into the period of Solomon, for "The time of Solomon was one when the deepest practical questions of life engaged the thought of the wise." To this argument we raise three objections. (1) the term, "The Sons of God," is unknown in the literature of Solomon's time, yet plays no little part in Job; (2) "the philosophy of the book" is entirely foreign to the time of Solomon, for in Job there is none of the materialistic pessimism and fatalism so evident in Ecclesiastes, etc.; (3) the entire mode of presentation is unique in Job and finds no parallel in the literature of the age of Solomon.

It is further claimed that "The Proverbs of Solomon in parts move in the same circle of ideas as Job." To this we reply that much in Proverbs is simply a compilation of current, well-formed, and fixed expressions, gathered together by Solomon. It is no argument, therefore, against the early date of Job, for as we have already shown Solomon was influenced by and borrowed from Job. Indeed, this is unconsciously admitted by Delitzsch and Raven when they point out "the masterly and original way the questions of 'Wisdom' are dealt with in the Book of Job."

Another argument advanced by these scholars is "the wide knowledge of foreign nations displayed in the book also confirms the Solomonic date." This we hold to be an assumption not borne out by either secular or biblical history. As early as Abraham diplomatic correspondence and intercourse can be proven to have existed from Genesis and such tablets as the Tell-el-Arna. Hommel clearly shows that the internal evidence of the Book of Job, as regards foreign relations, shows not a late date but such allusions are "the reminiscences of a former and closer connection between the Arab tribes extending from the banks of the Euphrates through Central Arabia to the Jordan." Indeed, he would go even further and identify Job with "the powerful Edomite chief Job of the land of 'Uz'" who is spoken of as "Ayab" on one of the Tell-el-'Amarna tablets." Moreover,

Lepsius, Schlottmann, and others, have conclusively proven that "The communications with Egypt were frequent, and indeed, uninterrupted during the patriarchal age."

Indeed, the only strong argument in favor of Solomonic origin is the position of Job in the Canon. But this can readily be explained by supposing that likeness of contents and form caused it to be placed among the Sacred Writings. While it is true that Isaiah, Lamentations, etc., are poetic in form, they cannot be urged against our view, for in them the prophetic contents over-balance the form, whereas with Job the nature of the contents but emphasizes the likeness of form, and so secures for the book a resting place among the Sacred Writings. Its position, therefore, need not mitigate against the internal and external evidence of its most ancient origin.

3. The 700 B. C. Theory: This school, represented by such men as Ewald, Hitzig, etc., places the date of composition about 700 B. C., around the time of the decline in the kingdom of Israel. The arguments for this view are in the main two. It is claimed that in the book Providence is a subject of doubt. To this we reply that there are just as many and as strong expressions of doubt in the accepted literature of the time of Moses, of Joshua, and of Solomon, as well as in the oldest Psalms and the pre-Solomonic proverbs. It is further argued that the book depicts a nation plunged in "wide-spread misfortune." This argument is the result of a warped conception of the nature of the book. The misfortune spoken of in "Job is not national but individual."

4. The 600-400 B. C. Theory: This position numbers among its adherents such critics as Budde, Driver, Davidson, Cheyne, etc. One of their ilk, even more radical than these, Cornille, would place the date at 250 B. C. As the mainstays of this last school we may cite two main arguments, (1) the doctrines of Job are too advanced for any earlier date; (2) the linguistic peculiarities necessitate a late date.

As to the theological argument we hold that "the doctrines found in the Psalms and other pre-exilic literature are similar to the teachings of Job," and that, therefore, there is no necessity, even on the critical basis, to place the book after the exile. Moreover this fourth position is but a covert attack on inspiration and revelation. It is characteristic of these negative critics to give

late dates in order to escape any admission on their part of the possibility of divine inspiration and revelation.

As to the linguistic argument we have but to point out the inherent weakness of this angle of attack. In most cases it simply begs the question and proves nothing. Further we know that "different sections of the land had many local variations, both in words and in grammar." This being the case it is, to say the least, a precarious basis for any attack on any writing.

We conclude, therefore, that the date of the origin of the Book of Job is pre-Mosaic. As to the actual mode of composition, or author, whether direct from the hand of Job, from Elihu, or Moses on the basis of old documents, or whether as Sayce claims, "A Hebrew adaptation of a remnant of Ebonite literature" we must confess that no positive conclusion can be taken, though we believe that the evidence presented establishes an origin well within the time of Job, and most likely from his hand.

We turn now for a brief review of the critics in regard to the integrity of the Book of Job. Here again we find a house divided against itself, which we are assured is bound to fall. Many of the most advanced critics accept the book as one complete whole because of "the evident artistic plan of its arrangement." Others, just as advanced, assert a composite origin, thus impugning its integrity.

For instance, it is held that chapters 32-37, are "a later insertion." In support of this view the following arguments are advanced, (1) the silence of the prologue and epilogue as to Elihu; (2) Elihu "does not differ from the three friends, and therefore has no purpose in the book; (3) Jehovah answers Job directly, hence the Elihu episode interrupts the narrative; (4) that last infirmity of critical minds, "his style is inferior to the remainder of the book."

The first argument is subject to all the weaknesses of the argument from silence. To be effective here the critics must first prove the necessity of any mention of the Elihu episode in the prologue and epilogue. Further such passages as 32:3-12; 33:32, etc., clearly indicate that Elihu's position is in no way identical with that of the three friends of Job. Nor is it hard to discover why Jehovah answers Job directly. "Jehovah answers Job rather than Elihu because Job was the central figure," and because there is little or no ground for condemna-

tion in Elihu's remarks. And so far from interrupting the narrative, we hold that these chapters are the main binding link, for without them we could not explain the abruptness of "the answer from the storm." Even Driver admits their importance to the narrative for he says, "They attach prominence to real and important truths which in the book might seem not to have received their proper due." And does not this office require an exalted style? Therefore, the speeches can hardly be inferior in style to those of the rest of the book. And this is indirectly admitted by the critics themselves.

Another rejected portion comprises the prologue and epilogue. Cheyne rejects these "because thy are prose" and because Job is "rewarded in earthly blessings for his righteousness," which Cheyne considers "a sad concession to a low view of providential dealings." These are most marvelously keen and acute arguments indeed! No writer employing prose and poetry in one work is the author of the work! Further we can defy Cheyne to explain the poetry without the aid of the prose. And is it not most beatiful to see the critic, whom we believe to be quite human challenging the right of Almighty God to reward His faithful servant with "earthly blessings." The position assumed by Cheyne is rather "a sad concession" on his part that he does not believe in the providential care of God.

Cheyne likewise rejects "the speeches of the Almighty" as being "in bad taste" and "a disturbing element in the book." No doubt they do constitute "a disturbing element" to the conscience of the critic, and must prick it pretty hard. But, be this as it may, without these speeches the book remains an inexplicable enigma, and would end in an anti-climax, which is contrary to the genius of the Oriental mind. And it is "in bad taste" for the author to put a question of mere literary taste as a touch-stone of integrity. On the basis of individual taste any book can be torn to shreds. And then we may safely challenge Dr. Cheyne to produce any bit of literature as beautiful as these speeches. Surely, when so gifted a critic as Carlyle says, "I call the Book of Job one of the grandest things ever written with a pen" it hardly behooves Cheyne to speak of "bad taste."

We do not overlook the other portions of the book which have been attacked as later additions but these play little or no part among critics of note today, and so may be disregarded.

In closing we would refer briefly to the object of the book. Many positions have been assumed on this question. Some hold it to be an answer to the question. "Can goodness exist irrespective of reward?" This view is too narrow, for the book is far wider in its range, and moreover, "the object of the calamities was to try his (Job's) sincerity." Others hold that the object is to show "the effects of calamity, upon a truly religious spirit." Again the scope is too narrow, for chapters 1 and 2 would suffice to answer this question. (see, 1:21, 2:10; etc.). The noted English clergyman, G. Campbell Morgan, in his work *The Book of Job*, would make the object of the book the solution of the "Problem of Pain." But again the range is too confined.

The correct position would seem to be that the purpose of the book is to reveal "The Mystery of God's Providential Government of Man." Under this main purpose we may note four universal propositions,—

1. "The apparently arbitrary distribution of the good and evil of this life is not the result of chance or caprice....."
2. "The government of the world belongs, of right, to Him who created it;....."
3. "To know this is enough for man; and more than this he cannot know....."
4. "Man's true position is implicit trust in the infinitely Wise, Just and Good, and submission to His will."

Maywood, Ill.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN
AMERICA TOWARD MODERN THEOLOGY.

BY REV. AUGUST SPIECKERMANN.

It is highly interesting to watch the dogmatism which Modern Theology displays in propounding its theories. One who is not acquainted with its arrogant methods of investigation and arbitrary results might think that no other view can stand against the one held by this school. But many theologians refuse to accept its so-called secure results. Those opposing the new doctrines are as to mental equipment and achievement by no means inferior to the loud boasters of the new theories. The difference between the conservative and the liberal school lies in the various premises they proceed from. The Lutheran Church has always believed in free investigation, but has insisted that the Word of God must be at all times the basis of operation for all investigators and the rule and guide of all interpretations. Had Lutheran theologians always followed this rule, then divine and not human wisdom would have prevailed. Many men, however, think themselves superior, not only to their fellowmen, but also to God. Instead of availing themselves of the ideas laid down in Holy Writ as an explanation of religious truths, they think it necessary to bring everything in heaven and on earth before the court of their supposed infallible reason. They think themselves wise in using the scientific method of modern investigators. These methods are good, even if they are not infallible. Like the best things in the world, they have been misused. It cannot be denied that these men generally have been inspired and controlled by rationalistic and materialistic ideas. Like Drews, representatives of rationalism and materialism have shown themselves experts in explaining away what is not in harmony with their preconceived ideas. Bearing this in view we understand how modern theologians are mistreating the Holy Scriptures. Of course, they would not acknowledge it. They say, that the Bible is not the gospel, but contains it. That gives them a chance to eliminate all that does not find grace before the

court of their reason. Harnack in his *Das Wesen des Christentums* has given us proof enough of his ability, not to speak of the many unripe young men who thought it an honor to invent unreasonable and unbiblical hypotheses as an explanation of the difficulties. These hypotheses were at first, received with loud enthusiasm by the enemies of Christianity, but later when their uselessness was proved, they were thrown upon the scrap-heap. In the Lutheran Church in America there are, as far as we know, very few representatives of Modern Theology. The thought that there was none was recently shown to be wrong when, in the October (1912) number of the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, a writer under the heading, *The Minister and Modern Thought*, presented a view entirely different from that held by his Church.

His deviation from the doctrines of the Church does not seem to cause him much trouble, for he comforts himself with the idea, that the framers of our Confession formulated their testimony of faith for their own age, but that they bequeathed the right to coming generations to restate the Christian truths, as they might see them. We do not believe like the writer that our Confessions are something that we may change like a coat. On the contrary, we believe them to be something substantial and that no Church can do without them. Confessions contain dogmas. The dogma is the Christian truth as it is understood and believed by all believers in harmony with the testimony of the apostles. Its meaning, therefore, cannot be changed. We would certainly be of a different opinion; if we could share the evolutionistic belief of our friend. He writes: "The belief in organic evolution, including the appearance of man, for the overwhelming majority of scientific men has passed out of the stage of hypothesis and has become the working theory of science." The other day, reading in a German Magazine of Natural Science, the first words on which my eyes fell, were: "The evolutionary theory is a hypothesis and belongs by no means to the secure results of exact investigation." Since the biological problem has become the central interest of natural science, the evolutionary theory has been a scientific postulate. If it wants to be more, it has to refute the following objections of its opponents. (1) Numerous links which form the transition from one species to another, are lacking. (2) The changes brought forth by artificial breeding represent only new variations, but not new species.

Left to themselves, they will lose their characteristics. (3) Besides the species of plants and animals which have a great faculty of adaptation to changed conditions of life, there are numerous plants and animals which have this faculty of adaptation not at all or in a very small degree and perish in changed conditions of life. (4) We find on one side, all stages of development, from the animal consisting of one cell to the highest developed mammal, beings which have experienced no change in spite of a development of thousands and millions of years; and on the other side beings which have experienced all degrees of development and that under the same conditions. This contradicts the axiom that like causes have like effects. (5) The law of heredity on which the evolutionary theory rests, contains a contradiction, for heredity presupposes two conditions (a) acquisition of new characteristics; (b) constancy of the causes which call them forth. That is, an individual changes quickly and gains too many new characteristics, which disturb each other; then constancy is lacking in regard to the characteristics. Or an individual changes too slowly and needs too long a time which would prove a lack of constancy in regard to the causes.

From this it is evident that a working theory may be used as an explanation of the world's process, but that this alone will not establish any degree of scientific certainty. For this reason, Rudolph Virchow, the famous author of cellular pathology, opposed Haeckel at a meeting of natural scientists in 1877 when the latter demanded the introduction of Darwinism into the schools. The clear insight into the defects of the Darwinian theory caused many to be slow in accepting it. But to brand those hesitating as cranks or unscientific men, would be a manifest injustice, as many of them rank high as scholars and as to intellectual powers can stand any comparison with their opponents. It is not true either that the theologians usually fight every advance in science and play the part of the obscurantist. Hesitation in regard to the acceptance of new ideas is not identical with enmity and opposition to them. Our theologians in the Lutheran Church of America do not jump at every new doctrine, but wait until the ideas are cleared and settled. Then they accept them, or fight them, according to their conviction. They have fought those evolutionists who claimed to be theistic, but were rationalistic or even materialistic in tendency. Their at-

tacks upon Christian theology as laid down in our Confessions and their change of attitude toward the old-established conceptions of the Church show under what influence they are. They want to make the old doctrines pleasing to the age by restating them in the sense of modern ideas. But thus they deprive them of their saving contents and power. In stating them they use the same words, but ascribe an entirely new meaning to them. Many in Germany call this *Falschmuenzerei* and are pitiless in denouncing these word-jugglers.

What the evolutionists are going to do with our old-established doctrines, is hard to tell. The writer in the article, *The Minister and Modern Thought*, tells us that if man's ascent was from a lower order of animal life, then the "fall" of man must undergo revision, and be re-examined both from an exegetical and philosophical standpoint. The fall, our friend thinks, is by no means what it has currently appeared to be. I believe this sample of evolutionary exegesis is sufficient to show what we have to expect from a theology that is influenced by the same ideas as our writer. The Lutheran Church is not ready to accept theories that are resting upon hypotheses. It feels perfectly satisfied on the foundation of the prophets and apostles, of which Jesus Christ is the corner-stone, and prefers to keep its blessed doctrines in their purity and unchanged meaning. It believes in the Pure Word, and the writer made a mistake in attacking that which has made his Church so great.

Our friend is convinced of the necessity of following the inductive method in biblical studies, and is glad that it is used in theology as well as in other branches of science. He demands the use of the historical method and says that historical criticism is as old as biblical study. We, too, believe in the historical method of investigation to a certain degree, but we believe at the same time that no secure results are guaranteed by it. A thorough investigation of this method will show the correctness of our assertion.

The historical proof can take two courses: (1) Historical facts are shown by existing documents, and the different documents are examined concerning their harmony, discrepancies and authenticity. (2) Historical facts are derived from logical deductions of which there are no documentary traditions. The former method is safer, but it does not exclude the greatest er-

rors. For the investigator, in spite of his *voraussetzungslose Wissenschaft*, is inclined to be wilful in judging of the sources. If he is under a system of thought, and he generally is, he will use only those sources suiting him best. In spite of his objectivity, it will be impossible for him to distinguish between truth and error. This is hard to do in modern investigations. The descriptions of present-day events by truthful eye-witnesses are so full of contradictions that it is sometimes very difficult to get at the real facts. If that is true, how much more difficult will it be for modern investigators to fix the real facts of olden times, if only a few sources will be at their disposal? Their criticism can rest only on hypotheses and never lead to assured results. Even if a few sources should be harmonious, they gain no absolute certainty. For it is hard to decide whether one writer is not dependent upon another so that thus the age of the sources might be determined. But even those sources which are considered to be independent of each other, might have gained their contents from the same primary source. Many writers believe that the "myths of creation" are dependent upon each other. The belief, however, that they originated from one common primary source, explodes all these theories of dependence. The historical investigators offer us only probabilities. These, however, are very different from certainties. The real results of modern theology are not so great as they are claimed to be. Too many contradicting hypotheses are arrayed against each other. It seems to be with these inventive gentlemen as it is with our contemporary historians of whom no two agree in important matters. And while modern theologians fought among each other and hurled their attacks upon the Bible, the latter found mighty supporters and associates in Egyptian and Assyrian discoveries.

Beside the method described above we have the purely logical investigation of history which by deduction describes whole periods of history of which we know nothing. It operates with hypotheses still more than the former method. A German writer once made this clear by calling attention to the nephrite axe which had been discovered in the Fatherland. When the axe was found in Germany, the representatives of the logical method were at once ready with a theory. To them the discovery of the nephrite axe was sufficient proof that Europe was populated from the East, as in the Orient nephrite had already

been found. Objections were overruled. The discovery of more nephrite in Germany overthrew their conclusion entirely. This shows that every logical proof, every historical deduction is exposed to the grossest error. We can never reach secure results by the historical proof. Doubtful assumption is all we gain. We, therefore, have to choose between belief in the sources, or belief in the subtle combinations of an investigator who knows the hoary events of antiquity better than those eye-witnesses whose reports he tries to reduce to their true value by virtue of his historical proofs.

The Higher Criticism sets forth those principles by which everything shall be determined, yet very different conclusions have been reached upon the basis of evidential facts. Let us look at the history of Israel. Those critics who deny the supernatural element in the history of this people and regard it as a product of only those forces which shape and determine all human history, cannot ascribe to this Israelitic history the same value and meaning as those critics who believe in the supernatural element of the same. And, indeed, Wellhausen and his friends who apply the evolutionary theory to the Old Testament, hold that the historical material, as we now have it is not to be accepted as the basis of Old Testament history, but that under the guiding of some philosophical theory this history has to be constructed out of it. Now we understand how Wellhausen is interested in beginning the Israelitic history on a very low stage. Monotheism was unknown to ancient Israel, he proclaims. He assumes, with others, polytheism at the beginning and then a gradual development. To him it seems impossible that such lofty conceptions existed, as the Old Testament attributes to the patriarchs and to Moses. The idea of the unity of God cannot be thought without the idea of the world and humanity. The idea of the world did not arise until the time of Amos when it was introduced by the Assyrian invasions. In the presence of that conception the petty nationalities lost their center of gravity, brute force dispelled their illusions, they flung their gods to the moles and to the bats. Thus Wellhausen sacrifices facts on the altar of his favorite ideas.

But every one now knows that the patriarchs and Moses had the idea of the world and also a high spiritual conception of God. The Israelites were a people whose traditions went back to Baby-

lonia and Mesopotamia. For centuries they had lived in Egypt, in the most brilliant period of its civilization. The code of Hammurabi with its high idea of God as the one before whom oaths have to be taken, shows how far the minds of the people were advanced. The Decalogue with its first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," is also a strong point in favor of monotheism, and a proof of the high conceptions current in Israel. Wellhausen can, therefore, not shake our belief in the Israelitic history, as contained in the Pentateuch. Nor can he change our view concerning the three different codes in the latter. He as well as other critics have compared their contents and reached the conclusion that they could not have one and the same author. Between their composition there are—thus, they say, long times in which revolutions occurred. The latter made a change of laws necessary. The Book of Covenant is the simplest. Therefore according to the laws of natural development it must be the oldest. In D. is to be seen a continuation of the Book of Covenant and a progress as to form and contents. Therefore D. must be of a later date. P. is the best developed and, therefore the youngest code. According to tradition D. is dependent upon P. Here you have a proof of the inventive brain of these gentlemen. By this procedure, of course, Moses is eliminated as author and also the idea of revelation. But if one believes in revelation, one must not apply the law of natural development to the laws of the Pentateuch as a means of explaining their origin, and must treat sacred history with the same respect as one treats profane history.

But what is history to them? Look how modern critics treat the patriarchs! To them they are not actual individuals, but personifications of tribes. Kuenen gives four reasons for rejecting the historicity of the patriarchal narratives: (1) There are the religious feelings which are ascribed to the patriarchs. (2) Insoluble chronological difficulties. (3) The familiar intercourse of the deity with the patriarchs. (4) The persons who appear as actors in the narratives are all progenitors of tribes. This is an argument from religious ideas, and proceeds upon the assumption that in the days of the patriarchs religion must have been in a rudimentary stage. It is, however, refuted by other critics who assume that the patriarchs were not inferior to the prophets of the eighth century in pureness of religious insight

and inward personal piety. It is evident that all these theories shamelessly treat history which should be the basis of their investigators, and not the playground of their wilful procedures.

The Lutheran Church has always showed the highest respect for the sacred history of the Old and New Testaments. It saw in the Old Testament history revelations of a progressive plan of salvation which has its culmination in the person of Christ. Modern Theology, however, denies the divine character of the revelation and of the people of the revelation. And that not for historical and critical reasons, but on principle. It makes use of that material only which can be adjusted to its theories. Everything else will be relegated to the realm of legends and myths. The arbitrary treatment of the Bible and the attack upon that which is dearest to Christian hearts has aroused the Church everywhere and raised the question whether such unfair dealings shall be allowed to continue in the Church of the Pure Word. The Lutheran Church is not one-sided and has never limited true investigation. By the latter we understand an investigation that makes use of the material in the Old and New Testaments as every other true science does of its material when it applies the true scientific method of investigation. The methods used by Modern Theology are often nothing but theories inspired by prejudice and rationalistic and naturalistic ideas.

The application of the evolutionary theory, too, is, as we have seen, not permissible, as it would mean a changed attitude toward all those beliefs so dear to our hearts. We have looked upon them as firm truths. Truth cannot be changed or it would cease to be truth. The form in which it is presented may change and be subject to theological and ecclesiastical change, but not the meaning. The meaning cannot be preserved by adding to it or by detracting from it. The wishes of modern theologians to allow some of their radical conclusions to be absorbed by the Confession of the Church is impossible, as the Church does not operate with unhistorical and unchristian hypotheses, but with truths based on reliable history and universal experience. She can have no communion with men who have left the ground of the Holy Scriptures and are out of harmony with the Confessions of the Church of Christ.

Princeton, Neb.

ARTICLE IX.

THE CONFESSIONAL HISTORY OF THE GENERAL
SYNOD.

BY WAYNE O. KANTNER.

INTRODUCTION.

We believe that the great confessions of our Church have been composed and accepted under the guiding hand of the Holy Spirit. If they are to be truly worth while, they must set forth in clear, definite and correct statements, the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God. We believe, too, that the Augustana, or Unaltered Augsburg Confession, is a correct exhibition of those fundamental doctrines. The Augustana is the distinctive confession of the Lutheran Church. In a positive manner, it states the difference between the doctrines of the Lutheran Church and the Church of Rome. It also sharply distinguishes our position from that of the Reformed Churches.

In the formation of confessional statements we find that there are always two influences at work. On the one hand, there is the tendency which lays too much stress on traditions, which hesitates to step out from the old, even where error exists. On the other hand, there is the attitude of mind which gives no weight to past customs or former teachings, which desires to separate itself entirely from the old, even from rich truths.

At the time of the Reformation the Lutheran Church took a conservative position. In her confessional statements she separated herself from all the errors of Rome. At the same time, she was broad enough to retain all that was good in the old system. She did not go to the extreme; as did the Reformed Churches. In fact, the Augsburg Confession is as firm in its rejection of the extreme radicalism of the Reformed Churches as it is positive in its confutation of the errors of Rome.

Thus in her confessional writings the Lutheran Church has always taken the middle ground. She accepts the plain Scriptural statements with simple, childlike faith. She is not deceived by the superstition of Rome. Neither is she led astray by

the Rationalistic tendency in the Reformed Churches. It may be objected that in Germany the Lutheran Church has come under this latter influence; but this can easily be traced to the forced union with the Reformed branch in the present State Church.

As we take up the history of the confessional basis of the General Synod, let us consider it in the following order:

- I. The Period of Organization—1820.
- II. The Establishment of the First Theological Seminary—1826.
- III. The Recognition of the Augsburg Confession—1829.
- IV. The York Resolution—1864.
- V. The Amended Constitution Adopted—1869.
- VI. The Action at Hagerstown—1895.
- VII. The Action at Des Moines—1901.
- VIII. The Richmond Resolutions—1909.
- IX. The Latest Developments in Our Confessional History.

I. THE PERIOD OF ORGANIZATION—1820.

The deputies that had been appointed by the several synods to draw up a constitution for the General Synod, met at Hagerstown, Md., on Sunday, October 22, 1820. The following morning, at nine o'clock, they went into business session. The Rev. Dr. Kurtz, of Baltimore, was called to the chair; and the Rev. Pastor Muhlenberg, of Reading, Pa., was appointed Secretary. Deputies were present from the following Synods: From the Synod of Pennsylvania, 8; from the Synod in the State of New York, 2; from the Synod in North Carolina, 2; from the Synod in Maryland, 3.

"It was much regretted by all present that from the Synod in the State of Ohio the expected Deputies did not appear."¹

After two days of deliberation, the constitution was unanimously agreed to, and a resolution was passed according to which it was to be submitted to the several Synods in the United States for consideration, adoption and confirmation. Among the

1 "The Constitution of the Ev. Lutheran General Synod in the United States of N. A., together with the Proceedings of the Convention in which it was formed." Page 4, English Edition.

various provisions of the Constitution the following paragraphs appeared:

1. "The General Synod shall examine all books and writings, such as catechisms, forms of liturgy, collections of hymns, or confessions of faith, proposed by the Special Synods for public use, and give their well considered advice, counsel or opinion concerning the same.

2. "Whenever the General Synod shall deem it proper or necessary, they may propose to the Special Synods or Ministeriums, new books or writings of the kind mentioned above, for general or special, common or public use. Every proposal of the kind, the several or respective Synods and Ministeriums shall duly consider, and if they, or any one of them shall be of opinion that the said book or books, writing or writings will not conduce to the end proposed, then and in such a case it is hoped that the reasons of such opinion will be transmitted to the next convention of the General Synod, in order that the same may be entered on their journal.

3. "But no General Synod can be allowed to possess or arrogate unto itself the power of prescribing among us uniform ceremonies of religion for every part of the Church; or to introduce such alterations in matters appertaining to the faith or to the mode of publishing the Gospel of Jesus Christ (the Son of God, and ground of our faith and hope) as might in any way tend to burden the consciences of the brethren in Christ."²

In the Constitution no reference was made to the Augustana, or to any of the other Lutheran Symbols. Richard, in his "Confessional History of the Lutheran Church," accounts for this through the fact that the Pennsylvania Ministerium had more deputies present than the combined number of representatives from the other three Synods. The Synod of Pennsylvania was very loose confessionally. In fact, the Ministerium was confessionless in so far as our Lutheran Symbols were concerned. The attitude of this body can readily be seen from the following resolutions, passed in 1822:

"Resolved, That a Committee of Synod be appointed to consult in the fear of God on the propriety of a proposition for a general union of our Church in this country with the Evangelical

² Ibid, page 7, The Constitution, Art. III, Sec. II, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.

Reformed Church, and the possibility and the proper manner of carrying out eventually such a proposition."³

Although the deputies from the Pennsylvania Ministerium were in a majority, it was possible for the other Synods to out-vote them; for the voting upon the Constitution was done synod by synod, each Synod having one vote. Nevertheless, the attitude of the Ministerium toward confessional matters, was, no doubt, responsible for the moulding of a constitution in which no mention is made of any of our Lutheran Symbols.

In 1823 the Ministerium of Pennsylvania withdrew from the General Synod. This gave the other Synods the opportunity to indicate more clearly their position in confessional matters. This position was made plain two years later when provision was made for the establishment of a Theological Seminary.

II. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FIRST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY —1825.

When the General Synod met at Frederick, Md., in October, 1825, it was proposed that plans be drawn up for the establishment of a Theological Seminary. The following resolution was passed:

*"Resolved, That Revs. B. Kurtz, J. Herbst, S. S. Schmucker, B. Keller, and Messrs. Harry and Hauptman, be a committee to prepare a plan for the establishment of a Theological Seminary, and that they govern themselves by the instructions which shall be given by this Synod."*⁴

This resolution was passed, and the instructions were given to the committee on Monday, November 7th. The following day the committee made their report. After the report had been discussed and amended, it was adopted by the Synod. Among its provisions was the following resolution, in which the Augustana received recognition:

"Resolved, That the General Synod will forthwith commence, in the name of the Triune God, and in humble reliance on His aid, the establishment of a Theological Seminary, which shall be exclusively devoted to the glory of our Divine Redeemer, Jesus

³ See Richard's "Confessional History of the Lutheran Church," page 606.

⁴ Minutes of Gen. Syn., 1825, page 4.

Christ, who is God over all, blessed forever. And that in this Seminary shall be taught, in the German and English languages the fundamental doctrines of the the Sacred Scriptures, as contained in the Augsburg Confession."⁵

This resolution indicated a favorable attitude of the General Synod toward the Augsburg Confession, and also opened the way for its further recognition in 1829.

The following committee was then appointed to form a plan for a "Seminary of Education": Pastor S. G. Schmucker, Dr. Lochman, Dr. Endress, Pastor Geissenhainer and Pastor Muhlenberg. In the Constitution for the Seminary which was drawn up, was the following provision:

"Every Professor elect of this institution shall, on the day of his inauguration, publicly pronounce and subscribe the oath of office required of the Directors, and also, the following declarations: 'I solemnly declare, in the presence of God and the Directors of this Seminary, that I do, *ex animo*, believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the inspired word of God, and the only perfect rule of faith and practice. I believe the Augsburg Confession and the Catechisms of Luther to be a summary and just exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God. I declare that I approve of the general principles of church government adopted by the Lutheran Church in this country, and believe them to be consistent with the Word of God. And I do solemnly promise not to teach anything, either directly or by insinuation, which shall appear to me to contradict, or to be in any degree more or less remotely inconsistent with the doctrines or principles avowed in this declaration. On the contrary, I promise, by the aid of God, to vindicate and inculcate these doctrines and principles in opposition to the views of Atheists, Deists, Jews, Socinians, Unitarians, Arians, Universalists, Pelagians, Antinomians, and all other errorists, while I remain a Professor in this Seminary."⁶

III. THE RECOGNITION OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION—1829.

When the General Synod met at Gettysburg, Pa., in October,

⁵ Ibid, page 5.

⁶ General Catalogue and Constitution of the Theological Seminary, published in 1840, page 10.

1827, a resolution was passed which authorized the "Committee on the Hymn Book and Liturgy" to draw up and report a constitution for the government of the District Synods. The men on this committee were: S. S. Schmucker, C. P. Krauth, G. Shober, S. G. Schmucker and B. Keller. The Committee were to have the report ready at the next meeting of the General Synod, so that the proposed constitution could be acted upon, and could be recommended to the several Synods for adoption. The object was to encourage the District Synods to adopt a uniform constitution.⁷

In October 1829 the General Synod met at Hagerstown, Md. It appeared that certain parts of the Constitution of the General Synod were misunderstood by certain "well meaning persons, and that the change of a few words would remove the difficulty." Therefore the following resolution was passed:

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to take into consideration the Constitution of this Synod, and report, whether or not, any amendment be requisite."⁸

On this committee the following were appointed: Revs. Heim, Cline, Morris, and Messrs. Berlin, Nusz and Shryock.⁹

The committee on the Constitution reported "that, for the sake of perspicuity and to obviate misconstructions, it be recommended to the different Synods to adopt the following amendments: after 'Evangelical,' Article 2, part 1, insert 'Lutheran'; to Article I, Section 5, add 'on non-fundamental doctrines'; Article 3, Section 8, after 'in general,' add 'in order that the blessed opportunities to promote concord and unity and the interests of the Redeemer's Kingdom may not pass by neglected and unavailing'; to Article III, Section 6, add, after 'orphans of,' 'poor.'"¹⁰

The report was adopted. On Monday evening, October 26th, the Committee that had been appointed two years before to draft a uniform constitution for the District Synods, made their report. But the consideration of the constitution was deferred till the following day. On Tuesday almost the entire session was given to a discussion of the proposed constitution. In the even-

7 "Minutes of Gen. Synod, 1827," page 3.

8 "Minutes of Gen. Synod, 1829," page 5.

9 *Ibid*, page 5.

10 "Minutes of Gen. Synod, 1829," pages 6 and 7.

ing, after the constitution had been amended, the following resolution was passed:

*"Resolved, That it be, and it is, hereby recommended to the different Synods, united in the General Synod, to adopt this Constitution for their government."*¹¹

The new constitution required all those who appeared for licensure and ordination to answer the following questions:

1. "Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practice?

2. "Do you believe that the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God are taught in a manner substantially correct in the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession?

3. "Do you promise, by the aid of God, faithfully to perform all the duties enjoined on you in this formula, and to submit yourself to its rules of Government and Discipline, so long as you remain a member of a Lutheran Synod?"¹²

The following post-script was appended to the Constitution:

"P. S.—As different Synods might differ in opinion relative to matters of a minor nature, so many particulars only as are necessary to general uniformity and harmony of operation among the churches, were introduced into this formula. Each Synod adopting this Constitution has the power to form such by-laws as may seem proper to itself."¹³

For the period covering the next thirty years we find a modified Lutheranism as above indicated. Some of the men during this period took great liberty with the clause, "Substantially correct." An effort was made to introduce into the General Synod a confessional basis of a nondescript character. This was known as "The Definite Platform," which was in fact accepted by a number of District Synods; but this American Recension was never brought formally before the General Synod.¹⁴

IV. THE YORK RESOLUTION—1864.

The spirit of loose confessionalism and modified Lutheranism was checked when the General Synod met at York, in May, 1864.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, page 8.

¹² *Ibid.*, pages 38 and 39.

¹³ *Ibid.*, page 40.

¹⁴ See the "*Lutheran Observer*," Jan. 19, 1912, page 4, article by Dr. Keyser.

As this period was a trying time in the national life, so it was a trying time in the General Synod. Two forces were at work. On the one hand there was the Pennsylvania Ministerium, which had been in 1858 readmitted to the General Synod. It had swung from its theory of unionism and its lax confessional principles, and had accepted all the Lutheran Symbols. On the other hand, there was the "Definite Platform Party," which endeavored to introduce an element that would have de-Lutheranized our Church in America. The General Synod had to use great care in order not to be influenced unduly by either party.

When the General Synod met at York, two new Synods applied for admittance. The matter of their reception was referred to a special committee. The committee recommended that a resolution be passed admitting the Synod of Minnesota; but in regard to the Franckean Synod of New York the following resolution was recommended:

"Resolved, That the Franckean Synod be admitted as an integral portion of the General Synod, so soon as they shall give formal expression to their adoption of the Augsburg Confession, as received by the General Synod."¹⁵

The report of the committee was adopted. But the delegates from the Franckean Synod, feeling that there had been a misunderstanding of the attitude of their Synod toward the General Synod's Confessional Basis, submitted the following communication:

"As we think that there was a misunderstanding on the part of the General Synod in regard to the position of our Synod relative to the doctrinal position of the former body, we therefore beg leave, as the delegation of the Franckean Synod, to inform the General Synod that, in adopting the Constitution of that body the members of the Franckean Synod fully understood that they were adopting the doctrinal position of the General Synod, viz., 'that the fundamental truths of the Word of God are taught in a manner substantially correct in the Augsburg Confession.'

Philip Wieting
N. Van Alstine
S. A. Rosenberg
John C. Shutts."¹⁶

15 Minutes of General Synod, 1864, page 12.

16 Ibid, page 17.

This communication was read before the General Synod, and, on Monday, May 9th, after considerable discussion, the following preamble and resolution were adopted:

"Whereas, The Franckean Synod of New York has made application for admission into the General Synod and has adopted its Constitution and sent delegates to the meeting; and,

"Whereas, These delegates have declared in writing that their Synod clearly understood that, in adopting the Constitution of the General Synod, it adopted the doctrinal basis of the General Synod; and,

"Whereas, It is desirable that said Synod should express, in a more formal manner, its adherence to said doctrinal basis; therefore,

*"Resolved, That the Franckean Synod is hereby received into connection with the General Synod, with the understanding that said Synod, at its next meeting declare, in an official manner, its adoption of the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession, as a substantially correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God."*¹⁷

As the *ayes* and *nays* were requested by more than five members, the vote was taken by roll-call, resulting in 97 ayes, 40 nays, and 2 non liquet. On the following day the delegates from the Pennsylvania Ministerium submitted a letter of protest, in which they contended that the General Synod had violated its Constitution in admitting the Franckean Synod. In view of this violation, which, they declared, compromised their Synod in requiring them to "assent to anything conflicting with the old and long established faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church," the delegates of the Ministerium withdrew from the General Synod. The Pennsylvania Ministerium had attempted to influence the General Synod to over-emphasize the confessional basis, and to exclude the Franckean Synod through a slight technicality. The General Synod refused to be thus influenced.

On Wednesday, May 11, at the evening session, certain amendments to the Constitution of the General Synod were proposed; but the discussion of the proposed amendments was not taken up till the next day. The first amendment was relative to certain changes to be made in the number of delegates to be sent to the

General Synod. The Second Amendment defined more clearly the position of the General Synod with regard to her confessional basis. The latter amendment read as follows:

"Amendment to Art. III, Sec. 3, in relation to the admission of Synods. Strike out Sec. 3, and insert the following:

"All regularly constituted Lutheran Synods, not now in connection with the General Synod, receiving and holding with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers the Word of God, as contained in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession, as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word, may, at any time, become associated with the General Synod, by complying with the requisitions of this Constitution, and sending delegates to its Convention according to the ratio specified in Article II."¹⁸

A resolution was passed that the "propositions for the amendment of the Constitution of the General Synod be sent down by the Secretary to the Presidents of the several District Synods" in connection with the General Synod, "with the request that they lay them before their respective Synods for decision."¹⁹

After arranging for the proposed changes in the Constitution, the Synod next turned to the consideration of certain errors that the Augsburg Confession was alleged to contain. The General Synod made clear its position by adopting the following preamble and resolutions:

"Whereas, The General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States has recognized the Augsburg Confession, both in the Constitution of the Theological Seminary and in the Constitution recommended to District Synods, as well as in her Liturgy; and,

"Whereas, Our churches have been agitated by the imputation of grave and dangerous errors in this Confession, so that amid conflicting statements many who are sincerely desirous of knowing the truth are distracted, knowing not what to believe, and the danger of internal conflict and schism is greatly increased; and,

"Whereas, The General Synod, according to its Constitution,

¹⁸ Minutes of Gen. Syn., 1864, page 29.

¹⁹ Minutes of Gen. Syn., 1864, page 38.

'shall apply all their powers, their prayers and their means towards the prevention of schisms among us,' we, therefore, in Synod assembled, in the presence of the Searcher of hearts, desire to declare to our churches and before the world, our judgment in regard to the imputation of these errors and the alienation among brethren which may arise from them:

"*Resolved*, That, while this Synod, resting on the Word of God as the sole authority in matters of faith on its infallible warrant, rejects the Romish doctrine of the real presence or Transubstantiation, and with it the doctrine of Consubstantiation, rejects the Romish mass and all the ceremonies distinctive of the mass, denies any power in the sacraments, as an *opus operatum*, or that the blessings of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, can be received without faith; rejects auricular confession and priestly absolution; holds that there is no priesthood on earth but that of all believers, and that God only can forgive sins; and maintains the divine obligation of the Sabbath; and, while we would with our whole heart reject any part of any Confession which taught doctrines in conflict with this, our testimony; nevertheless, before God and His Church, we declare that, in our judgment, the Augsburg Confession, properly interpreted, is in perfect consistence with this our testimony and with the Holy Scriptures as regards the errors specified."²⁰

The effect of the adoption of the York Resolution was to establish the General Synod securely with the Augustana as her confessional basis. This critical period in the General Synod is characterized most admirably by Dr. L. S. Keyser, in an article that appeared in *The Lutheran Observer*, Jan. 19, 1912, where he says: "Was not the York convention of the General Synod in 1864 a most crucial time, a time to make men's hearts quail? On the one hand, there was the powerful confessional element of the Pennsylvania Ministerium, which had accepted all the Symbols, and which had now withdrawn on account of the Franckean Synod's reception; on the other hand, there was the 'Definite Platform' element, with powerful leaders, who, though sincere, would have de-Lutheranized the General Synod. In these ominous and trying circumstances, how did the General Synod deport herself? With the utmost dignity, reserve and

honor. She did not yield to the rigid confessionalism, on the one hand, nor to the lax confessionalism, on the other; but she grandly passed the York Resolution, which, properly interpreted, simply means, "The Augsburg Confession, nothing more, nothing less." The General Synod did not turn to either of the extreme elements; she kept her poised and dignified position 'in the middle of the road.'"²¹

V. THE AMENDED CONSTITUTION ADOPTED—1869.

When the General Synod met at Harrisburg, Pa., in May, 1868, the matter of the proposed amendments to the Constitution was once more taken up. The Revision Committee was composed of the following members: S. W. Harkey, S. S. Schmucker, S. Sprecher, and J. A. Brown. On Friday, May 18th, the committee reported the result of their work through Dr. Harkey:

"Resolved, That the draft of the amended Constitution just read be re-committed to the committee who have prepared it.

*"Resolved, That, after such alterations as the committee may yet desire to make, the committee have five hundred copies of the proposed Constitution printed for examination by this body, and that the subject be made the special order for next Tuesday morning, immediately after the reading of the minutes."*²²

On Tuesday morning the special order of business, viz., the consideration of the proposed amendments to the Constitution, was taken up. The document was discussed item by item. At noon the Synod adjourned till the following day. Several Sections of the Constitution had been adopted on Tuesday. At the Wednesday session the remaining Sections were discussed and adopted. The Constitution was then adopted as a whole.

In order to clear up all ambiguity as to the dates and particulars at this interesting epoch, we add the following historical data: In 1864 at York several amendments were proposed, and it was voted that they be submitted to the District Synods. At the convention of 1866 the secretary reported that the majority of the Synods had adopted the proposed amendments. One section contains almost word for word the formula of confes-

²¹ *The Lutheran Observer*, Jan. 19, 1912, article, "About Making Concessions," by Dr. L. S. Keyser.

²² Minutes of Gen. Syn., 1868, pages 14 and 15.

sional subscription adopted in 1869. At the convention of 1866 a committee was appointed to examine the Constitution of the General Synod, revise it so as to meet the needs of the time, and report at the next meeting. This committee made its report at the meeting of 1868, and their report was adopted by the General Synod, and ordered duly submitted to all the District Synods for consideration. The next convention occurred at Washington in 1869, when the officers reported that all the Synods had acted favorably on the proposed constitution, and it was therefore declared adopted by the General Synod. This famous Constitution contains the formula of confessional subscription that was in force from 1869 to the latest convention held at Atchison, Kansas, (1913) when the present formula was declared adopted unanimously by the District Synods. These details are of some historical value, because it is sometimes said that the new Constitution was adopted in 1868 and at other times in 1869. Its final adoption took place at the latter date at the meeting in Washington, D. C., as stated in our Book of Worship.

In the new constitution the word "*substantially*" was eliminated and the phrase "*a correct exhibition*" was substituted. Thus the spirit of the York Resolution was embodied in the Constitution of the General Synod. When the General Synod met at Canton, Ohio, in 1873, the following resolution relative to the York Resolution was passed:

"Resolved, That the preamble and resolution adopted at York, Pa., in 1864, expressing the judgment of this Synod that certain erroneous views often ascribed to certain articles of the Augsburg Confession are not contained in the same, be regularly published in the minutes of this body and in the Book of Worship, in immediate connection with the constitution of the General Synod."²³

VI. THE ACTION AT HAGERSTOWN—1895.

Although the York Resolutions had been passed and the new formula adopted yet for twenty-five or thirty years the influence of the "Definite Platform" element was felt. While the words "substantially correct" had been eliminated from the

23 Minutes of Gen. Syn., 1873, pages 10 and 11.

Constitution, nevertheless the men who favored a lax interpretation of our confessional basis found a loop-hole in the word "fundamental." These men maintained that the word "fundamental" referred to the Confession instead of to the Scriptures. Thus, instead of the Augsburg Confession setting forth a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God, and all the doctrines set forth by the Confession being considered of fundamental importance, it was claimed that the Augsburg Confession exhibited some doctrines that were not fundamental, and that these need not be accepted. Men differed greatly in what they understood by the term "fundamental doctrines." The subject was discussed for years. At least, it again became necessary for the General Synod to make clearer her position with regard to her confessional basis. The matter was taken up when the General Synod met at Hagerstown, Md., in June 1895. The Committee on Resolutions offered the following statement relative to the Confessional basis:

"Whereas, A fear is expressed by some that the basis of the General Synod may be changed by enlargement so as to include other Symbolical Books beside the Augustana; and,

"Whereas, A conviction is held that an effort is in progress to reduce to a lower standard, in thought and spirit, the present form of acceptance of the Augsburg Confession by the General Synod; therefore,

"Resolved, That, in order to remove all fear and misapprehension, this Convention of the General Synod hereby expresses its entire satisfaction with the present form of doctrinal basis and confessional subscription which is the Word of God the infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as throughout in perfect consistence with it—nothing more, nothing less."²⁴

Dr. Samuel A. Ort was responsible for the draft of this resolution, which was adopted without a dissenting vote. Even Dr. J. W. Richard, a leader of the liberal interpreters of the Confession, spoke in favor of it on the floor of the Synod and said: "That is just what we want."²⁵

²⁴ Minutes of Gen. Syn., 1895, pages 62 and 63.

²⁵ Dr. L. S. Keyser is authority for this statement.

VII. THE ACTION AT DES MOINES—1901.

When the General Synod met at Des Moines, Ia., in the spring of 1901, the following resolution was recommended by the Committee on Resolutions and was adopted by the Synod, without discussion or dissent:

"Resolved, That, in these days of doctrinal unrest in many quarters, we rejoice to find ourselves unshaken in our spiritual and historic faith, and, therefore, we re-affirm our unreserved allegiance to the present basis of the General Synod, and we hold that to make any distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental doctrines in the Augsburg Confession is contrary to that basis as set forth in our formula of confessional subscription."²⁶

Dr. L. S. Keyser was largely responsible for the introduction of this resolution. In *The Lutheran Observer*, in an article, "About Making Concessions," Dr. Keyser says: "The writer himself humbly confesses that he was mainly responsible for that resolution, and he wants to say, with all his might and main, that he never once thought of the General Council in the whole transaction. The only purpose was to express a sincere conviction that our credal formula does not warrant us in rejecting any of the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession on the ground that they are not '*fundamental*.'"²⁷

VIII. THE RICHMOND RESOLUTION—1909.

Another step was taken by the General Synod in its convention at Richmond, Ind., June, 1909. At this meeting Dr. L. S. Keyser, who had been the official delegate of the General Synod to the General Council at Buffalo, N. Y., the previous autumn, made his report. In this report attention was called to a number of Theses adopted by the General Council relative

²⁶ Minutes of Gen. Syn., 1901, pages 83 and 84.

²⁷ *The Lutheran Observer*, Jan. 26, 1912, page 3, article, "About Making Concessions." Dr. Keyser, who has read this manuscript, desires to add, in justice to all concerned, that he is responsible for the *substance* of this statement, and not wholly for its admirable *form*. The credit for its form is due, for the most part, to the careful and painstaking thought of the Rev. Dr. A. C. Miller, who was chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, and Rev. J. S. Dysinger, who was a valuable member of that committee.

to the confessional basis of the General Synod. In the theses certain criticisms had been made on the position of the General Synod. But the official delegate reported: "It is due to the cause of Lutheran unity and good will to add, in conclusion, that all discussions in the General Council relating to our confessional and other differences so far as we heard them, were conducted in a kindly and fraternal spirit."²⁸ The official delegate recommended that the General Synod recognize the theses of the General Council in a suitable manner and gave the following reasons for so doing:

"First. To ignore those theses would be to cast a slight and contempt upon the General Council that so honorable a body does not deserve and that would display a spirit unworthy of a great Christian Body like the General Synod.

"Second. Our self-respect as a Lutheran body calls for a proper defense and vindication of our confessional position.

"Third. Silence would be sure to be construed as evidence of our inability to maintain our present doctrinal basis.

"Fourth. The cause of unity and good will in our Lutheran Zion makes an explicit statement on the confessional questions raised by the said theses both advisable and necessary."²⁹

By vote of the General Synod Dr. Keyser was requested to read a series of statements and resolutions which he had drawn up in answer to the said Theses. After motions to refer, and to lay on the table had been voted down, the statements and resolutions were adopted by a powerful vote of the Synod. They brought out the following pertinent facts:

1. *That* "the General Synod's declarations concerning the Augsburg Confession are sufficiently clear and definite to be understood by all who will inquire into the collateral facts and historical data and will give close attention to the precise language used in the General Synod's official statements."³⁰

2. *That* the translation of the Augsburg Confession recognized by the General Synod is the one that was made by the Joint Committee of the General Synod, the General Council, the United Synod of the South, and the Joint Synod of Ohio. "As a common standard of the Augsburg Confession in Eng-

28 Minutes of Gen. Syn., 1909, page 56.

29 *Ibid.*, page 55.

30 Minutes of Gen. Syn., 1909, page 56.

lish;”³¹ That this translation was made from the *EDITIO PRINCEPS* of 1530-31, and that it is the Unaltered Augsburg Confession that is accepted.

3. *That* the General Synod accepts the Augsburg Confession *EX ANIMO*.

4. *That* the Augsburg Confession is understood in its “original and historic” sense.

5. *That* the General Synod considers the Augsburg Confession to be sufficient for her confessional basis, yet she honors the other Symbolic Books, and holds them in high esteem.

6. *That* the General Synod is thoroughly evangelical, and holds that the “Bible is the Word of God.”

At the same meeting of the General Synod the following resolution was passed:

“Resolved, That the following declarations, with the headings prefixed, be printed in all future editions of the Augsburg Confession published by the General Synod, whether issued in separate form or in our Book of Worship, and that they be inserted immediately after the York Resolution.”³²

“THE GENERAL SYNOD’S CONFESSIONAL BASIS.

“The confessional basis of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States of America is as follows:

“We receive and hold, with the Evangelical Lutheran church of our fathers, the Word of God, as contained in the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word.

“EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.

I.

Here the Resolution adopted by the General Synod at Hagerstown, Md., June 15, 1895, is quoted in full.

³¹ *Ibid*, page 57.

³² Minutes of Gen. Syn., 1909, pages 59-61.

II.

The Resolution adopted at Des Moines, Iowa, June 6, 1901, is also quoted in full.

III.

"Resolved, That, inasmuch as the Augsburg Confession is the original, generic Confession of the Lutheran Church, accepted by Luther and his coadjutors, and subscribed to by all Lutheran bodies the world over, we therefore deem it an adequate and sufficient standard of Lutheran doctrine. In making this statement, however, the General Synod in nowise means to imply that she ignores, rejects, repudiates or antagonizes the Secondary Symbols of the Book of Concord, nor forbids any of her members from accepting or teaching all of them, in strict accordance with the Lutheran regulating principle of justifying faith. On the contrary, she holds those Symbols in high esteem, regards them as a most valuable body of Lutheran belief, explaining and unfolding the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, and she hereby recommends that they be diligently and faithfully studied by our ministers and laymen. (Adopted by the General Synod, at Richmond, Ind., June 8, 1909.)

IV.

"Whereas, The phrase, The Word of God as contained in the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, occurs in our formula of confessional subscription; and,

"Whereas, When our fathers framed this language the theological distinction between the two statements, 'The Bible is the Word of God,' and 'The Bible contains the Word of God,' had not yet been made, or at least was not yet in vogue, and therefore there could have been no intention on their part of committing the General Synod to lax or heretical views of the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, but, on the contrary, a sincere desire to plant her firmly on the true doctrine of Biblical inspiration; and,

"Whereas, the General Synod has ever occupied the same position with reference to the true and complete inspiration of the Canonical Scriptures; therefore,

*"Resolved, That we herewith declare our adherence to the statement, 'The Bible is the Word of God,' and reject the error implied in the statement, 'The Bible contains the Word of God.' (Adopted by the General Synod, at Richmond, Ind., June 8, 1909.)"*³³

IX. THE LATEST DEVELOPMENTS IN OUR CONFESSIONAL HISTORY

At the session of the General Synod in Richmond, Ind., in 1909, a resolution introduced by Prof. Jacob A. Clutz, D.D., was passed, instructing the Common Service Committee "to codify the several resolutions and statements explanatory of the Doctrinal Basis of the General Synod." This codification was to include the Resolutions adopted at York, Pa., 1864; at Hagerstown, Md., in 1895; at Des Moines, Iowa, in 1901, and at Richmond, Ind., in 1909. The committee were instructed to have their report ready at the next meeting of the General Synod, and were specially instructed to make no alteration in the substance of the General Synod's Confessional basis. When the Common Service Committee made their report to the General Synod at Washington, D. C., June 1911, they recommended the following changes in the Constitution:

"First Amendment. The insertion of a new article to be known as

ARTICLE II. DOCTRINAL BASIS.

"With the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the fathers, the General Synod receives and holds the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and it receives and holds the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the faith and doctrine of our church as founded upon that word."³⁴

"Second Amendment. The insertion of another new article, namely,

33 Minutes of Gen. Syn., 1909, pages 60 and 61. NOTE: In the minutes as printed, the exact reading is, "Adopted by the General Synod, at Richmond, Ind., June 8, 1908"—1908 being printed in error for 1909.

34 Minutes of the Gen. Syn., 1911, page 23.

"ARTICLE III. THE SECONDARY SYMBOLS.

"While the General Synod regards the Augsburg Confession as a sufficient and altogether adequate doctrinal basis for the co-operation of Lutheran Synods, it also recognizes the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalkald Articles, the Small Catechism of Luther, the Large Catechism of Luther, and the Formula of Concord as expositions of Lutheran doctrine of great historical and interpretative value, and especially commends the Small Catechism as a book of instruction.

"*Third Amendment.* Change the number of the present Article II to IV, strike out its third Section, and substitute for it the following:

"ARTICLE IV, SECTION 3.

"Any properly organized Lutheran Synod may be received into the General Synod at any meeting, provided it shall have adopted this Constitution, with its Doctrinal Basis as set forth in Article II."³⁵

In the report of the Common Service Committee, relative to the proposed changes in the Constitution, the following resolutions were embodied:

"*Resolved*, That, in accordance with Article VI, Section 2, of the Constitution, the Secretary of the General Synod be and hereby is instructed to make an exact copy of the intended alterations of the Constitution and send the same to the Presidents of the District Synods.

"*Resolved*, That if the proposed amendments are adopted, thereafter no explanatory statements or resolutions be appended to the printed copies of the Augsburg Confession or of the Constitution of the General Synod in any of its publications.

"*Resolved*, That if the proposed amendments are adopted, or any part of them, alterations in all of the publications of the General Synod to conform therewith are hereby authorized and directed."³⁶

The report of the Committee was adopted, and the proposed

³⁵ Minutes of Gen. Syn., 1911, pages 24 and 25.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pages 24 and 25.

amendments were referred to the District Synods, and were adopted in every case, during the sessions of 1911-12. In many of the District Synods, the measure passed without a dissenting vote.

At the last session of the General Synod, held at Atchison, Kansas, May, 1913, "the Secretary reported that all the Synods had adopted the proposed amendments to our Constitution, including the new formula of confessional subscription. The report was adopted without debate or opposition, and the Common Service Committee was instructed to have the changes made in all our official publications."³⁷

Dr. J. A. Singmaster, in commenting on the re-statement of the Doctrinal Basis of the General Synod, makes the following germane observation: "The Amendment, Art. II, Doctrinal Basis, is intended to be, and, to my mind, is, simply a less ambiguous statement of the present basis, and is entirely in harmony with the repeated deliverances of the General Synod and with its instructions to the Common Service Committee. The amended form is its own interpreter. It can be understood only in one way. It declares our acceptance of the Bible as the only rule of faith and of practice and of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as properly setting forth the teaching of our Lutheran Church which is founded on that Bible. This, then, is our basis, the Bible first, and the Augsburg Confession in entire harmony with it."³⁸

CONCLUSION.

We have traced the various steps of the General Synod in relation to her confessional basis. They by no means indicate a corresponding number of distinct changes in her Confession; neither do they indicate the evolution of a confessional system. The General Synod, to-day, with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, stands squarely upon the inspired Word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and she accepts the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as correctly exhibit-

³⁷ Quoted from a letter of Dr. L. S. Keyser, May 23, 1913.

³⁸ *Luth. Church Work*, Sept. 19, 1912, page 10, editorial: "by Dr. Singmaster on, 'The Re-statement of the Doctrinal Basis.'"

ing the faith and doctrine of our Church from that Word. From the time the General Synod first indicated her attitude toward the Lutheran Symbols, in 1825, she has always accepted the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, she has never thought of accepting a *variation* of any kind.

It is true, men arose in the General Synod, well-meaning men, sincere and earnest, who attempted to interpret the Augustana apart from its original and historic sense. In order to offset the influence of these men, the General Synod found it necessary, from time to time, to issue official statements which set forth, in language that could not be misunderstood, the confessional declarations that were being construed in a spirit apart from the original and historic sense. The General Synod has not attempted to change her confessional basis; she has simply tried to make it clear.

We feel that the Holy Spirit has given His gracious and divine assistance to our Church in her attempt to state clearly the fundamental truths of the Word of God in the form of a confession. May the future history of our Church be still more glorious than the past! May all the Confessional statements of our Church ring as clear and true as the words of Peter when he said, "Thou are the Christ, the Son of the living God."

Battle Creek, Mich.

ARTICLE X.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

In the April number of *The Lutheran Church Review*, Dr. Theodore E. Schmauk, the editor, discusses "The Reunion of Christendom" from the standpoint of the Lutheran Church. He calls attention first to the difference between the true unity of the Church and the proposed external union of Christendom. The former "is a fact already established in the divine mind, and already made manifest, to those who have eyes to see, in the spiritual body of Christ." This is the teaching of the Augsburg Confession which declares that "for the true unity of the Church, it is sufficient to agree upon the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments." Dr. Schmauk believes that a visible union of Christendom is not desirable, because it would necessarily involve the repression of personal freedom in the development of the spiritual life. It is true that there would be many apparent advantages in the solidarity of Christendom and relieve it of the reproach of countless sects; but the necessary centralization of power leads to evils which are illustrated in the Papacy. The plea for efficiency—to work on a larger scale, more promptly, and with less expenditure of energy—is as delusive as the great trusts.

The chief point of interest for us, however, is the position of the Lutheran Church in the proposed reorganized Christianity. The author's opinion is that it would have everything to lose and nothing to gain, that it would sacrifice itself and its supreme mission as a witness to the truth. Our history shows that ever since we have been in America, our Church has not counted for much "in the counsels of a common organized American Christianity." "Our power lies in other lines: we are not masters of organization, and as parts in a general whole, we cannot expect, except as we are prophets, and not statesmen, to be very much more than a piece of clay in the hands of the potter. Our banks of clay are desirable material for new combination, and there may be some masters in principle and policy, who rise up

amongst us, who make themselves and their principles felt powerfully, and who will be respected accordingly, in such a united Christendom; but *as a Church*, we shall be led, rather than lead: we shall be tolerated in our convictions, rather than teach, in a Reunion of Christendom." "The Scotch-Irishman, the Anglican, the Roman of Irish and other bloods, is our superior in the management of externalities, and we shall find to our sorrow, that we shall stand as we have stood, in the eyes of those round about us, in the relation of an appendix, rather than in that of a head and heart, to a common Christendom."

The Lutheran Church should learn from its long and dearly bought experience the folly of attempting union with other Churches. In Germany, England and America the result has always been the same. The time is not yet; her hour has not yet come.

We are not sure that Dr. Schmauk has properly diagnosed the whole case; but we agree with him heartily in the general trend of thought that the Lutheran Church cannot enter into a compact which would destroy her usefulness as a witness for the truth as she apprehends it. Surely, her providential task, as far as union is concerned, is to remove misunderstanding and aloofness in her own great family before she can participate in world-wide movements for the "reunion" of Christianity. We do not share Dr. Schmauk's poor opinion of the Germanic lack of statesmanship and management of externalities. A modern Germany contradicts this opinion most emphatically.

The Constructive Quarterly in its second (June) number maintains its high character for scholarship, breadth of thought and scope of articles. James Denney in writing on the "Constructive Talk of Protestantism," holds that the Church has failed in part, because it has not done justice to its intellectual task. "Emphasis has been laid almost exclusively on immediate religious experience as contrasted with the intellectual statement or explanation of it." "For intelligent hearers preaching has too much ceased to be educative. It is all subjective, moralizing, psychological, hortatory, sentimental." Hence, it is incumbent on Protestantism to restate the faith in a constructive way so as to appeal to intelligent people. The three subjects which demand this are: The Doctrine of Christ, The Doctrine of the

Church, and The Doctrine of a World Order. In the elucidation of these topics much of suggestive value is uttered. In reference to Christ, however, I fail to see any distinctive contribution in the remarks of Dr. Denney. What he says is commonplace. No doctrine which claims absolute deity for our Lord will find acceptance with Unitarians and Rationalists; and yet without this fundamental ground firmly maintained the Church would cease to be more than a humane society. In reference to the Church Dr. Denney very properly insists that it must not be regarded as the rigid institution as conceived by the Roman Catholic. The primary function of the Church is worship, then witnessing, and fellowship. All this implies forms of thought, of order and of discipline. The Church, however, must not be so rigid as to repress individual freedom. It must also be properly related to the various causes and movements of a moral and reformatory character; but it does not follow that it must directly promote any reform. It has its own motives and ideals and it must not snatch at the weapons of the State. The Church must never surrender Christian education. The State can not give it. The third point aims to show that the modern rationalistic construction of the world-order, which leaves out Christianity and the supernatural, is untenable. "In spite of the dominance of ideas like evolution—or rather because of the illegitimate and one-sided dominance of such ideas—it is incumbent on Protestant Christianity, with its critical instinct, to construct a view of the world more equal to all the facts, a philosophy which will not ignore but justify the most significant phenomena in the spiritual life of man." With due deference to the devotion and the ability of Dr. Denney, I am of the opinion that the task of Protestantism lies more in the construction of a Doctrine of the Word of God than of any other. The acceptance of the Bible as the Word of God would settle many of the questions which perplex professed Christians. A rational theory of inspiration, that conserves the content of revelation without insisting upon a mere mechanical use of the sacred writers by the Holy Spirit, is not only possible but necessary. Let us by all means stand by the oracles of God as the only infallible rule of faith and of practice.

In the *Hibbert Journal* (April) Captain W. Cecil Price speaks enthusiastically of "The Boy Scout Movement" in Eng-

land. He says "As to the movement itself, it stands in need of no justification. On many grounds, but chiefly on the grounds of educational training and patriotic welfare, the creation of the Boy Scouts has grown to the dimensions of a national event. Sir Robert Baden-Powell's foresight has been amply rewarded by the steady development of a scheme big with important issues, which in the eyes of those who come after us may very likely appear one of the capital enterprises of the twentieth century. The movement is essentially a training, a discipline, a suppression of unregenerate instincts, a first education in the difficult school of unselfish citizenship."

"Here are the Scouts' ten 'articles of faith': 1. A scout's honor is to be trusted. 2. A scout is loyal. 3. A scout's duty is to be useful, to help others, and to do a kind action every day. 4. A scout is a friend to all, and a brother to every other scout, no matter to what social class the other belongs. 5. A scout is courteous. 6. A scout is a friend to animals. 7. A scout obeys orders. 8. A scout smiles and whistles under all circumstances. 9. A scout is thrifty. 10. A scout is pure in thought, word, and deed."

The scout movement embraces many lands. During the celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg scouts were employed by the Commission in charge as guides and errand boys. I am glad to bear testimony to their cheerful obedience and efficiency. Some object to the movement on the score that it fosters the military spirit, takes boys away from home, and exposes them to temptations incident to camp life. Pastors desiring to introduce this feature of work for boys should carefully investigate the matter before committing themselves to it.

The International Review of Missions, the leading missionary quarterly, among many excellent articles, contains one on "The Livingstonia Mission" by Donald Fraser, which may be said to be typical of mission work in the interior of Africa. The mission was founded in 1875 by the United Free Church of Scotland in Nyasaland, and has a sphere of 50,000 square miles with a population of 400,000 people. At the first progress was slow on account of wars and the generally disturbed condition, but gradually the gospel began to have its beneficent effect. Magis-

trates of the British Government were appointed later, giving a sense of security to the weaker people. "Schools were springing up in all directions, and each of them was as good as an armed fort for keeping peace in the neighborhood. Great numbers of the men were learning to work, and were proving that the rewards of industry are greater than those of war." "There is no doubt that the greatest pioneer agency for Christianity has been the schools." There are no sudden conversions. The daily Bible lesson and daily worship awakened the people, and the first converts came from the schools. Most of the subsequent converts were made through the efforts of native Christians. The close tribal relations stimulated converts to win the entire tribe. Missions within this mission—both home and foreign—have been founded and have had a most beneficent effect, in stimulating giving and in widening the horizon of the Christians. The old gospel, though poorly preached, has been a great power. The sense of the nearness of an omnipotent, loving God has been a wonderful thing to a poor fearful people surrounded by powers which they could not control. The chief hindrance to the gospel has been the failure to convert the vice-steeped leaders. The main vices are licentiousness, with its attendant polygamy, and drunkenness.

The total Christian community is now over 30,000, with 735 village schools with 47,000 pupils on the roll. About 1300 adults are baptized annually.

"The practicability of the Christian Life" is ably vindicated by Dr. Francis G. Peabody of Harvard University in *The Harvard Theological Review* (April). The question is often asked and frequently answered negatively, Can a man now-a-days live "soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world"? as was enjoined upon Titus. "Is it possible to live in the world as it now is, accepting its methods, participating in its business, involved in its social, economic, and political machinery, and at the same time maintain a sober, righteous, and godly life, fit to adorn the doctrine of God?"

A negative answer comes from many who interpret the gospel with extreme literalism, imposing upon the present generation with its complicated civilization the simple aphorism intended for small rural communities long ago. The pessimists deny the

possibility and even the desirability of perpetuating primitive Christianity. The extreme view of eschatology, which looks for the end of the world at this period and that only to be disappointed, fails to inspire men with the ancient ideals. Advanced theology, by practically discrediting the gospels, naturally annuls the idea of the unworldly life. Moreover, the inconsistencies of professed Christians apparently deny the force of the gospel standards. And the heroic conduct of men like Tolstoi, who endeavored to forsake the world, speak loudly of the impracticability of trying to live as Titus was asked to do.

Unfortunately these conceptions of the inapplicability of Christian ethics are wide-spread, and from them have followed two sorts of consequences. "On the one hand is the sentimental approval of a faith which cannot be reduced to practice. One may cherish the teaching without any idea of obeying it. Christian conduct becomes regarded as a Catholic layman may view the *vita religiosa* of the clerical orders." "On the other hand is the more candid and open reaction from a code which is inconsistent with modern demands. If, it is argued, all that can be substituted for an incredible theology is an impossible ethics, then, it would seem, the Christian religion must be frankly discarded as inconsistent with modern thought." There can be no doubt that there has been a serious defection from Christianity, not only by the frivolous but by sober, cultured people. Many scientists have completely dismissed Christianity from their thinking.

"What is the fundamental fallacy in these discouraging conceptions of Christian ethics? It is the confusion of the temporary, occasional, and incidental aspects of the Gospel with its universal, spiritual and permanent message. Literalism applied to the New Testament—however reverent it may appear to itself to be—is essentially unhistorical. It forces each incident or phrase into the foreground of the picture, so that it has no environment of time or place, no shading or perspective; and that is to pervert history in the name of piety." "The Christian religion is a much larger thing than many of its critics, or even of its defenders, have supposed. It assumes many forms but is exhausted by none." "The greatness of Jesus is seen in his having so many ideas, for any one of which men have been willing to die." Two great words announce the nature of his teach-

ing—Power and Life. "They are the symbols of a dynamic faith. Power is generated to be applied. Life is given to be transmitted." Christian ethics is a science of spiritual dynamics. It deals with a world in motion. Its purpose is to communicate Power; its aim is to increase Life." Jesus Christ had a passion for personality. He sought the one sheep, the one lost coin, the lost son. He touches every age, not indeed in the language of the past, but through his influences which are instinct with Power and Life.

Professor John Alfred Faulkner, of Drew Theological Seminary, presents an exhaustive paper in the April *American Journal of Theology*, on "Luther and the Bigamous Marriage of Philip of Hesse." The facts set forth in the paper are derived largely from the work on the subject by Professor William Walker Rockwell of Union Seminary—a work which Dr. Faulkner pronounces a miracle of learning. Luther's reluctant approval of Philip's bigamy is viewed from all sides—in the light of history, of expediency and of exegesis. This act of Luther's, stigmatized as an ineffaceable blot on his character and his career, has many extenuating features, when all things are taken into consideration. The age in which Philip lived was licentious; and it is somewhat to his credit that his conscience sought a dispensation which would mitigate his horror of himself. Of course, his acts were entirely without justification; and Luther was terribly mistaken in the remedy which he allowed for Philip's sin. "Mistaken" is the word. Dr. Faulkner completely indicates him against the charges of cowardice, of condoning adultery, and of political diplomacy. Luther argued that in the Old Testament God had sanctioned a plurality of wives in extraordinary cases, and that hence in this extraordinary case it might be tolerated again. Moreover, divorce was not to be thought of for a moment; while a continuance of Philip's illicit relations could not be approved. Hence, Luther, with Melancthon, Bucer and others, agreed to a secret marriage under the seal of the confessional. Luther never saw the wrong of it, and subsequently justified his attitude. This is the long and the short of the scandal, which Luther's enemies through the centuries have reiterated and exaggerated. It is an exceedingly unpleasant

episode in Luther's life. But why should perfection be looked for in any man however great? We trust that studies like that of Rockwell and Faulkner and Preserved Smith will put to silence the perversions of Luther's single great mistake.

Professor Gabriel Campbell of Hanover, N. H., treats the subject of "Philosophical Aspects of Religious Experience" in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. What is experience? is an open question. Can it be clearly differentiated from reason or philosophy, as Kant endeavored to do? His views demanded revision, however great the service he rendered in his "Religion within the limits of Pure Reason." The best and noblest thinkers have always been religious. The following are some of the truths validated by experience: The Existence of God, The Immortality of Man, The Freedom of the Will, The Evolution of the Spiritual, Religion as Service.

The primary truth—the existence of God—is confirmed by experience. Science can not measure the infinite; but that does not prove its non-existence. Space is real and undeniable though unmeasurable. The existence of mind in man points to the mind of God, the producer. The Infinite Mind must be capable of all the acts and possibilities of unlimited Personality.

The other truths above noted are the rational deductions from undoubted facts in human experience.

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M., B.D

The reform of theological studies is a subject of serious discussion at present. It is a matter of firm conviction on the part of a large and increasing number of churchmen that the courses offered and the methods employed do not adequately equip the theological student to meet the demands which will be made upon him as preacher and pastor. There is a growing conviction that the theological faculties of the universities have not entirely kept pace with the times and that consequently the theological courses and methods of training are obsolescent and insufficient. Many suggestions are made looking towards the betterment of the present status. The theologians themselves have recognized the need of some reform and have set themselves to work upon the serious task thus placed before them. This is especially true of those

who have to do with the departments of practical theology, for they are particularly concerned to meet the direct needs of the Church.

The discussion does not confine itself to the subjects that are to be included in a course of training for the pulpit and pastorate, nor to the orderly disposition of those subjects, nor to the method of their preservation, but it involves also the personality of the teachers, the function in general of the theological faculty at the university, and the merits of a course at the so-called "preacher seminary." The arguments for reform are cumulative. The demands for changes have become pressing and the suggestions have assumed a very practical aspect. As early as 1886 Boremann of Frankfurt issued a vigorous "address to Professors, Pastors and Students" in which he set forth the insufficiency of the theological courses and raised the demand for reform. From that day to this there has been a constant stream of essays and articles emphasizing the same need for reconstruction. Of late years the suggestions have assumed the form of books and the religious and theological literature of the current year indicates unmistakably that the subject has attracted the attention of quite a wide circle and that the question is rapidly becoming acute.

As to a reform in courses of study to be pursued by the theological student Professor Paul Lobstein of Strassburg in a recent number of *Die Christliche Welt* gives extended notice and comment to a suggestive series of changes proposed by a French Protestant, Pastor Trial of Aimes, in his book, *La Reforme des etudes theologiques*. Trial argues that the nature of the theological course must be determined by the end that is had in view. This end, he maintains, is the training up of efficient pastors rather than learned theologians. Now the proper equipment for an efficient pastor is two-fold. In the first place, his inner calling demands that his life be grounded upon a personal experience of the Gospel. Then, too, his scientific training should have made him thoroughly acquainted with the needs and requirements, the aims and interests of his own day and generation. Accordingly the theological course should follow two general directions, the one practical, the other modern, and along both lines Trial calls for reform. The theological studies should be more practical, inasmuch as the Gospel is not a theory, a doctri-

nal complex, nor a philosophical or dogmatic system, but a divine power which lays hold on the entire inner man, conscience, feelings and will. The theological studies should also be more modern, inasmuch as it is imperative to understand and appreciate the man of to-day so as to improve his morals and develop his religious nature. Only thus will the pastor be relieved of his present embarrassing and faltering attitude in the presence of the questions and tasks of modern culture. Only thus will the ministry become an attractive vocation and a sphere of real usefulness to its generation.

Trial's first suggestion along the practical line is that the student be introduced to the entire mental atmosphere of the Scriptures and be made thoroughly acquainted with every part of the Bible. He should so sink himself in the Word as to gain a living sympathy with the religious personalities of the Old and New Testaments and thus make the divine content of revelation an element of his own inner life. And this close personal acquaintanceship with the Bible can easily be attained without the minute learning of philology. Thus some of the time now devoted to the languages might better be devoted to the Bible in the vernacular. Trial makes a long argument against the present practice in regard to the study of Hebrew and Greek in the theological course. If the knowledge of the original languages of the Bible is an indispensable element in the minister's success and not merely a requirement of examining committees, then the study of those languages should be carried on to such an extent that the student may be able to judge of the translations we now have, to improve upon them where possible, and to penetrate to the original ideas of the authors as well as their words. But if the knowledge of those languages is not indispensable, then the theological student may well leave them to the specialist, the philologist, with his peculiar tastes and talents along those lines and may well content himself with the splendid modern translations of the Bible. In either case the present method of procedure is unjustifiable and is a striking instance of the need for reform in the direction of greater practicality.

By way of making the theological course more modern and up-to-date, Trial suggests that the emphasis in all the historical studies shall be upon the present. Under the present system the student knows too much about the gray past and too little about

his own times. This must be changed if the pastor is to minister to needy men of his own day. The theological student must be introduced to the problems and conditions of the present and this should be the aim of all his study. The history of the Church in past ages should be studied merely as means of understanding the present and only in so far as it does lead to such an understanding. The purpose to be kept constantly in view is practical service of the needs of to-day.

A thorough philosophical training also is necessary. Thus systematic theology broadens its scope to become a science which has regard for all the interests of the present and really assumes the role of apologetics. The classification of the philosophical discipline is determined entirely by the purpose of serving the Church. The philosophy of science leads to an understanding of the results of the chief modern natural sciences. The philosophy of morals furnishes the material for Christian ethics. The philosophy of art furnishes the basis for a satisfactory answer to those who find in art a substitute for religion. The philosophy of society gives an understanding of present-day sociological problems. Finally, the philosophy of religion makes the student acquainted with the results of the two sciences, the history of religion and the psychology of religion, and thus gives him an intelligent conviction of the uniqueness of the Christian faith and the absolute character of the Gospel religion.

It is therefore no small task which Trial prescribes for the theological student. But he regards his program as entirely feasible, for he proposes to throw overboard much of what he calls mere learned ballast. To that end he distinguishes between learning and scientific training. Learning is a quality to be reserved for the specialist. Now there will always be a few students who have the taste and the capacity to become specialists. They may well give themselves over to erudition and detailed scholarship because they intend to devote their lives to special research along the line of some chosen theological discipline. But the vast majority of theological students will want to become efficient pastors and for that purpose what they need is not so much a body of knowledge and erudite learning but rather a scientific training for their special calling. This involves above all that they should be trained in inner religious experience and that they should be so thoroughly familiar with the

needs of their times as to be able to apply their own inner possession to the meeting of those needs. This means radical changes in the method of treatment of theological branches so as to eliminate much that is at present unnecessary and burdensome.

The French pastor warmly commends several features of the German system, the many seminars in the university and especially that arrangement which provides for two examinations before the pastoral office is assumed, the one an examination on the scientific studies of the candidate, the other an examination of his practical attainments after the lapse of a year of practical work (usually in teaching). But in general his demands for reform are as applicable to the German situation as to the French. And this the Germans willingly recognize.

But there are those who go much further than Pastor Trial in their program of reform. They seek not merely a change in courses and methods but an entirely new system. They are in favor of dispensing entirely with the university course of training in theology. Such is the case with Pastor Emil Engelhardt who voices his program in an essay *Forderungen für eine andere Ausbildung der Pfarrer*. He insists that the primal need in the ministry is for strong personalities. The presence or absence of ripe religious personalities will determine the rise or decline of the Church in her power and usefulness. The supreme task of the Church for her future ministry, therefore, is to develop personalities. This none may regard as impossible since Jesus has lived.

But what is the Church doing in this direction? Certainly the courses of lectures by the professors of the theological faculties in the universities are doing nothing whatever to provide personalities for the pastorate. Their chief concern seems to be to develop theologians, and it is a well-known historical fact that the theologians have injured the cause of Christ far more than they have ever helped it. The author then speaks of his personal experience at the university and asserts that the only benefit he gained was from his association with other men and through the personal impress of some of the professors. The chief thing which the universities have to offer the future minister is theology and this is utterly useless in the pastorate because it usually leads to the false conclusion that the pastor must feed his

people with thoughts *concerning* religious life, whereas their supreme need is for religion and life itself. This can be imparted only through living religious personality.

Engelhardt suggests therefore a veritable revolution in theological training. What he seeks to inculcate is not a study of systems but an experience of religious life. Jesus did not set His apostles to the learning of systems and philosophies, but led them into an immediate personal communion with God. So also those who are to help to-day in establishing the Kingdom of God ought to be gathered about strong religious personalities whose personal companionship they can experience and whose deeds of love they can copy. Engelhardt instances such men as Löhe, Fliedner, Uhlhorn, Bodelschwingh, and Johannes Müller. Then, too, the candidate for the pastorate should read books, or rather, he should experience them. First of all the Bible should command his heart and then the classic illustrations of the mind of Christ in active operation among men.

This scheme would dispense entirely with the examination of the intellectual fitness of the candidate for the ministry and would provide for an easy and natural transition, after five or six years of work of love, into full standing in the pastoral office. Thus we should have realized completely Luther's principle of the general priesthood of believers, though we should be far from Luther's ideal of piety and far from the Reformation conception of the pastoral office. Professor Rade of Marburg, editor of *Die Christliche Welt*, comments editorially on this essay of Engelhardt's. He sees a certain justification in the complaint against the impracticability of the university course in theology and he maintains that the Church ought to open the way for ministers who have not studied. The vast majority, he insists, should have enjoyed a course of study. But there are always some who for some reason or other cannot compass a theological course but who are yet qualified by talent and disposition to render valuable service to a congregation. Such he thinks ought to be permitted to enter the pastorate without the preliminary intellectual requirements.

If such expressions are true signs of the times, then we might conclude that the position of the theological faculties in the German universities is becoming somewhat precarious. And, indeed, there are not a few indications that the pendulum is near-

ing the opposite extreme from that which once made theology the queen of the sciences and allowed the theological faculty to exercise absolute dictatorial powers over all the other faculties. Time was when all European civilization and culture was the direct work of the Church and received its expression, its form and its direction at the hands of the clergy. The entire complex educational system was under the absolute control of the ecclesiastics. But in the course of time the secular sciences have risen to a position where they are independent of the theological sciences and the theological faculty has long since been reduced to the level of the philosophical, medical, and juristic faculties.

To-day it is with difficulty that the theological faculty holds her own, not merely because it has come to be widely recognized that her courses and methods are in need of reform, and not merely because other means have been suggested for preparing ministers, but for purely scientific reasons. For under the influence of the religio-historical school, that newest theological arrival, with its method of comparative religions, it has been suggested in certain quarters that the theological faculty could be dispensed with, seeing that theology can be resolved into the science of religion, which is purely a matter of historical investigation and philosophical construction. There is no immediate danger that this suggestion will be carried into execution, but it is at least an indication that the German universities have long since been emancipated from the control of ecclesiasticism. And it surely cannot be without significance that at the two new universities soon to be established at Hamburg and at Frankfurt a. M. no provision whatever has been made for theological faculties.

But even as regards the practical needs of the Church for efficient preachers and pastors, far-sighted churchmen are gradually coming to the conviction that the university courses in theology are inadequate. These are indeed profitable and necessary, but more is needed, something beyond a mere reform of the theological courses and beyond even the year of teaching or other practical work before assuming the pastoral office. This need can best be met by the institution known as the "preacher seminary." Trial in his book warmly commends the German seminar. He points out that in the regular lecture periods the student ought to have the professor's printed outlines in his hands

so as to be able to follow thoughtfully without being obliged to take notes constantly. He also holds that the hearers should be allowed to ask questions, to call for explanations, and to express opinions, so that there might be co-operation between teacher and taught rather than the continuous monologue which so often shoots over the heads of the hearers or falls on inattentive ears. All this naturally suggests the preacher seminary. And Lobstein in his article shows that the theological faculties at present have a mongrel task, that of fostering purely scientific theology and that of equipping candidates for the practical ministry. The natural remedy would be a division of labor with another sort of institution.

The basis of our theological courses in the universities of to-day was laid by Melancthon and revised by Schleiermacher. The times seem to demand a fundamental change. But none of the recent suggestions for reform have made substantial progress upon Schleiermacher's *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums*. This applies to Professor Clemen's *Zur Reform der praktischen Theologie*, despite his assertions to the contrary. Not a few voices are being raised therefore to suggest that the theological seminary provides an avenue of relief from the present exigency in the matter of equipping ministers. Professor Karl Eger in his book, *Die Vorbildung zum Pfarramt der Volkskirche*, proceeds to show that the present-day scientific theological course at the university does not adequately equip the candidate for the average pastorate. The calling of the ministry demands the same degree of thorough disciplinary preparation that any other vocation does. But in addition to that it demands of the minister a certain personal disposition. The conception of the pastoral office and of the proper preparation for it has varied from time to time. Luther and the Protestant orthodoxy immediately following him laid the emphasis upon the objective element in the pastoral activity, upon the preaching of the Word. The subjective element within the preacher was almost lost sight of. Then the pietists went to the other extreme and over-emphasized the personality of the minister and that too with a false ideal of piety (cf. Engelhardt). But Schleiermacher went back from Spener to Luther, and, in careful appreciation of both the objective and the subjective, demanded not only that the minister receive a thorough training in the theological sciences but also

that he manifest a certain measure of personal piety. Now Eger maintains that this latter element is not being supplied at present by the universities because of their one-sided intellectualistic tendency. And his conclusion is that the theological seminary is the indispensable complement to the theological training offered by the university. No mere revision of the university methods can remedy the situation.

Entirely in line with this is the book by Professor Paul Drews. *Das Problem der praktischen Theologie (Ein Beitrag zur Reform des theologischen Studiums)*. Drews holds that the practical theology of the university should give much more attention to the psychology of religion and to conditions of to-day and should limit itself to subjects of scientific and intellectual interest. Such practical subjects as homiletics, catechetics, and liturgics, he would leave entirely to the theological seminary. The latter he regards a necessary addition to the university course, furnishing opportunity for contemplation and assimilation of what has been received at the university and at the same time providing a training for the really practical tasks in preaching and in the care of souls. He would make a course at the theological seminary obligatory upon all candidates for the pastoral office.

From these various sides is the theological faculty of the German university being called in question. When in the course of time the Church and the State are separated, the problem of the theological faculty will become still more deeply involved.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE XI.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

Gettysburg: Stories of the Red Harvest and the Aftermath. By Elsie Singmaster. Pp. 190. Price \$1.00 net. Illustrated.

In this interesting volume Mrs. Lewars, formerly Miss Elsie Singmaster, under which name she still writes and publishes, has collected a number of stories that were first published in such magazines as *Harper's Lippincott's*, *McClure's* and *Scribner's*. They all deal with the battle or the battlefield. Some of them describe the terror that filled the hearts of the citizens, especially the women, when they saw the gathering of the troops about the town, and heard the rattle of musketry and the thunder of the cannon, and realized that a great battle was going on right at their doors, and the agony of those who knew that some of their own loved ones were with the battling hosts. One is the history of a boy whose home was near Round Top, but who had enlisted and now came back to fight at his own door. At the opening of the battle he became panic stricken and fled to his home, only to find it deserted and despoiled, but later when the battle surged that way he regained his courage, became a man again, and played a true hero's part. Several have to do with the many visitors to this shrine of patriotism, and especially with the guides who show them about the field and many of whom are, or were, old soldiers. The most pathetic of them all is the story of an old soldier who had lost his sight by an explosion in the battle, but came back on "Pennsylvania Day" hoping to find some compensation for his blindness by *feeling* his own name on the great monument among the other names that are there immortalized. But by some sad oversight or mischance his name had been omitted and was not there.

But the stories must be read to be really understood and appreciated. These notes are intended simply to give some idea of the feast of good things that awaits every reader of the book, and to whet the appetite for it.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

SOUTHERN PUBLISHING CO. MOBILE, ALABAMA.

Roman Catholicism Capitulating Before Protestantism. By G. V. Fradryssa, Doctor of Philosophy; Lecturer on Sacred Scrip-

tures; Synodical Examiner. Translated from the Spanish. Pp. 359. Price \$1.00 net.

The real name of the author of this book is Juan Orts Gonzales. He was formerly a Franciscan Monk and seems to have stood high in his order and in the favor of the Catholic Church and the ruling powers at Rome.

The book is one that Catholics will have to reckon with, and that ought to be read by all Protestants who really wish to understand the issues between Catholicism and Protestantism. It differs from most books written by converted priests or monks in that it avoids all vituperation, and makes no attempt to expose scandal or to heap shame and contempt upon the Papal Hierarchy. It is a keen analysis of the weak points in the Catholic position and doctrines, especially such as their doctrine of the Church, their attitude towards the Scriptures, and the dogma of Papal Infallibility. Much of it is in criticism of Cardinal Gibbons' *The Faith of Our Fathers*, and the criticism is not only fearless but sharp and keen and thoroughly logical, though always respectful and kept well within the limits of courteous debate. It would be interesting to know what reply the worthy Cardinal, or any of his followers, could or would make to such an indictment.

Dr. Gonzales has also written and published a number of tracts or pamphlets dealing with various phases of the controversy between Catholicism and Protestantism, or with the practical questions that arise in connection therewith. Their titles are *Romanism, the Greatest Problem Now Before American Protestantism*; *Do Roman Catholics Need the Gospel*; *The Best Means to Convert Roman Catholics*; and *Why so Few Roman Catholics Become Protestants*. The price of each of these is ten cents, and they can be procured from the author by addressing him Care of the Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va. His book can also be purchased directly from the author at the same address.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

EATON AND MAINS. NEW YORK.

The Making of Tomorrow. Interpretations of the World To-day. By Shailer Mathews, Dean of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. Pp. 193. Price \$1.00 net.

This volume is made up of some forty short papers, most of which originally appeared as editorial contributions to *The World of To-day*. They are grouped under four general topics, *The Common Lot*, *The Church and Society*, *The Stirrings of a Nation's Conscience*, and *The Extension of Democracy*. They

are written in Professor Mathews' well known interesting, vigorous and forceful style and abound in suggestive and stimulating thought.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Socialism, Its Strength, Weakness, Problems and Future. By Alfred Raymond Johns. Pp. 75. Price 50 cts. net.

This is a very readable, and informing, little book, a real *multum in parvo*. It follows much the same lines as Professor Ely's earlier and much larger volume on *Socialism and Social Reform*. It has the advantage of being simpler and shorter and of bringing the subject down to date. It is nearly twenty years since Professor Ely's book was published. Meanwhile the situation has changed somewhat, though the problems remain much the same. This book can be read in an hour and it is well worth reading. It will give food for many hours of thought. There is a brief "Introduction" by Rev. Charles Stelzle which adds to the value of the book.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Religion and Life. By Thomas Cuming Hall, Professor of Christian Ethics in Union Theological Seminary, New York. 12mo. Pp. xvi, 161. Price 75 cents net.

This is really a study in Comparative Religion. Perhaps it would be better to call it an introduction to such a study. The "Religion" with which it deals is not Christianity, but religion in general, which the author defines as "an inward attitude of reverent relationship to that which is thought of as for the time of supreme moment, resulting in outward expressions, personal and social, that form complexes of rites, beliefs, and customs." The book is a serious effort to set forth, in a brief and yet comprehensive and convincing way, the large, and important, and decisive, place which religion has held, and still holds, in the life of man, and to claim for it, therefore, that recognition which is its due in any view of man and his history and development that claims to be at all scientific or philosophical. It is a sturdy protest against that easy way of disposing of religion, which is affected by some writers, as a mere superstition, or the invention of priests, or a wholly personal and individual matter, which each man may be left to determine for himself.

It is a further protest against the idea often expressed that religion is only a passing, and now a well nigh passed, phase of human development, which does not deserve the serious consideration of thoughtful men. As the author says, "Even were we

convinced that what we know as religion was really being dethroned, and other convictions were taking its place, we would still have to understand religion to understand the past." And again, "As a mere force with which the historian or statesman must reckon religious feeling is to-day as important as it probably ever was in human history."

Some of the chief topics discussed are, What is Religion, The Primitive Character of Religion, The Priest and Religion, The Origin of the Prophet, The Determinist Controversy, The Way Religious Ideals Organize the Material Life, Ethics and Religion, Political Attitudes to Religion, &c., &c.

We especially recommend this excellent little volume to those who may not have the time or the taste for more extended study of the subject. And if it should awaken a desire for more thorough study of the questions involved, as we suspect that it will with many, they will find a very full and helpful bibliography at the close of each of the ten chapters.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

C. F. DANIEL, LTD. LONDON, E. C.

The Book Without a Name. By Oran Catellew. Pp. 173.

This is a strange title for a book. But it is no whit more strange than the book which bears it. A sub-title sounds the keynote more clearly, *Chiefly on Naturism, or the Religion of Science.* The book is a weak attempt to discredit Christianity and its Founder, the Church and the Bible, and to put in their place the so-called *Naturism, or the Religion of Science.* A single characteristic quotation will illustrate the general spirit as well as the fairness (sic) of the author, "If a preacher touches on the liquor question, he is in a difficult position, because the best paying member of his Church probably rents houses for rum shops, and because he believes that the founder of his religion made fifty or sixty gallons of alcoholic drink the first time he appeared in public, and the last command he gave to his disciples before his death was to drink alcohol in remembrance of him."

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY. OBERLIN, OHIO.

The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism.

By Melvin Grove Kyle, D.D., LL.D Pp. xvii, 320, 8 vo.
Price \$1.50.

So far as we know, this volume marks the first attempt to relate the principles and findings of archaeology to the theories of the higher criticism of the Bible. Good books on archaeology,

both general and special, are available, but they are merely repositories of information. They confirm the common understanding of the term, that archaeology is an antiquarian museum—the “old curiosity shop” among the sciences. That archaeology is a science in its own right, with canons of its own, is the contention of Dr. Kyle in Part I of his book. The function of archaeology in criticism is determined by the service which it can perform. It is the final arbiter because it is the science of foundations. Where it cannot exactly show what a thing was it can tell how it can have been.

Dr. Kyle, as the title of his book indicates, limits his studies to oriental archaeology, or the archaeology which touches the Bible. Much had been promised by the young science of oriental archaeology, and much ridicule had been heaped upon it because of its early claims. But Orr's prediction in “The Problem of the Old Testament,” that it bade fair to control both criticism and history is being fulfilled in his own day. Slowly but steadily the facts have been coming to light, by the diligent use of the textual critic's microscope and the excavator's spade. Redpath, Weiner, Dahse, Troelstra, Deissmann and others have been giving us the archaeological facts with regard to the languages of the Bible, while Petrie, Bliss, Macalister and the indefatigable Germans have been giving us the archaeology of the lands of the Bible. Under these disclosures such theories as the ignorance of the patriarchal age, the nomadic or semi-barbaric condition of Palestine in the patriarchal age, the evolution of Israel's culture from a Palestinian source, and many others which once held sway, have vanished, while the main lines of Old Testament history are being more and more firmly established. In Part III the author gives a very valuable assembling of the “assured results” of archaeology in the chronological order of the Old Testament history, and it is a surprising array. The critical theory gets cold comfort from Dr. Kyle's handling of the facts. By restoring the background of the Bible, by showing the anachronisms of many critical theories, by insisting upon the great fundamental tests of correspondence, Dr. Kyle claims that archaeology has given the deciding voice in the case of criticism, and the verdict is negative.

The book is so clearly and pleasantly written that no technical knowledge is required to follow the author throughout. It is a book for the layman, and it cannot fail to render immense service to Christian faith.

Dr. Orr has contributed an appreciative introduction.

H. C. ALLEMAN.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE. ST. LOUIS, MO.

Populaere Symbolik. Lutherischer Wegweiser zur Pruefung der verschiedenen Kirchen und religioesen Gesellschaften. Von Martin Guenther. 456 pp. Price \$2.

This work written by Prof. Guenther and first published in 1872, was in its third edition thoroughly revised by the successor of the author, Prof. L. Fuerbringer in the Concordia Seminary of the Missouri Synod in St. Louis. But for two years this work was out of print, and now Prof. Fuerbringer has prepared a fourth edition. It is the only real text book of Symbolics we have in this country as far as publications on this side of the Atlantic are concerned. The works that have appeared in Germany do not deal with all the religious associations, in America as does this work. It is especially valuable as a book of reference. It gives in a brief statement the position of a church and then quotes a significant passage from the confessional and other writings of such church. This fourth edition has been brought up to date by a so treating of a number of sects that have appeared in recent years, such as the Russellites and others. It is a very valuable work.

J. L. NEVE.

AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION. PHILADELPHIA.

A Beginner's Course in Bible Study. By James McConaughy. Cloth. Pp. 122.

This little hand-book, now in the sixth edition, was prepared by Dr. McConaughy for use in the schools at Northfield and Mount Hermon, whence it has gone forth to the larger constituency of the Sunday Schools. The studies are comprehensive, yet simple. The majority of them cluster about a great historic character. They consist not so much in the author's statement as in suggestive questions which the scholar is expected to answer from the Bible itself. This "course" deserves a wide circulation.

J. A. SINGMASTER

THE GRIFFITH AND ROLAND PRESS. PHILADELPHIA.

One Hundred Chapel Talks to Theological Students, with two Autobiographical Addresses. By Augustus Hopkins Strong, D.D., LL.D., President of the Rochester Theological Seminary. Cloth. Pp. vi. 264. Price \$1.00.

Dr. Strong gives us in this volume some brief heart-to-heart

talks, spoken to the students at a noon prayer meeting during the last year of his presidency of the Rochester Seminary. His remarks were taken down stenographically without his knowledge, but afterwards revised by him. They breathe a loving Christian spirit. They are suggestive rather than exhaustive. A pastor would find in them seed-corn for prayer-meeting talks. The most interesting part of the volume is the first address, entitled "Theology and Experience." Here he unveils himself and his earlier experiences with singular candor, revealing his wanderings from the narrow way and his discovery of Christ as a personal Savior. He speaks also of his academic achievements at Yale where he won various prizes in composition and speaking. He adds significantly, "Yet I now regret that I did not put my heart and mind more fully into the studies of the curriculum."

Of his European sojourn he writes that the edge of his religious feeling became dull, and that there is great danger that one may lose more than he will win, and he advises young men studying for the ministry to go to Europe after they have preached for a while rather than before.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

